

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2901. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 254. Resolution directing the Library of Congress to deliver to the Attorney General certain papers; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Leo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of the Washington Asphalt Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of the Reverend R. E. McKinney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1459. By Mr. HALE: Resolution of the New England Traffic League, recommending that the passage of Senate bill 942 as now drawn be opposed; that in lieu thereof the buyers and sellers of all modes of transportation be given the opportunity to confer for the purpose of determining what, if any, illegal or undesirable practices are now being pursued to draft a plan to govern future activities of all rate-making agencies, associations, and bureaus that will be lawful and practicable, such plan to be subject to the approval of Interstate Commerce Commission or such other governmental agency as the Congress may designate, as well as the Department of Justice; and that in order to make effective these recommendations the New England Traffic League urges the Congress and the Department of Justice to defer any action for a reasonable period pending the outcome of these cooperative efforts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1460. By Mr. HOPE: Petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1461. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1462. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1463. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 86 members and attendants at the convention of the York County, Maine, Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Berwick, Maine, on May 11, 1943, petitioning Congress to support all legislation which will prohibit the sale of beverage alcohol to the men in or around the camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1464. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Eliza H. Seany and 37 other citizens of Chehalis, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1465. Also, petition of Mrs. O. L. Soule and 17 other citizens of Elma, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for

the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. Also, petition of Christ P. Jacobsen and 56 other citizens of Cathlamet, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of the Connecticut Valley Pomona Grange, No. 11, Woodstock, Vt., opposing Senate bill 637 as reflecting on the capabilities of the American people to discharge this duty and endangering the freedom of the people; to the Committee on Education.

1468. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima, Grandview, Mabton, Sunnyside, and Pomeroy, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1469. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, T. D. B. S., M. A., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1470. Also, petition of the National Society of New England Women, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 2428 and 2429; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1471. Also, petition of the Consolidated Building Trades, Metal Trades, Central Labor Council of Vallejo, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1472. Also, petition of the Council for Pan American Democracy of New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the colonial system of government be ended in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1473. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Kerr committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all mankind, we acknowledge in reverence our dependence upon Thy daily providence. Thy mercies have proved unfailing. We remember, too, the grace of God, which abundantly pardons. In the light of Thy character and faithfulness our human imperfections are reflected. Our personal and national selfishness is registered in narrow conceptions of life and citizenship which hinder Thy holy pur-

poses for human welfare and world brotherhood. We make our confessions and ask Thy forgiveness. May this our repentance be registered in nobler and fuller living. We recognize Thy chastenings, and accept them as expressions of Thy wisdom. Yet our hearts have not fully turned back, neither have our steps declined from Thy way.

Strengthen today every worthy endeavor. Give us increased nobility of heart.

We pray for Thy servants who gather in our legislative halls, the President of the Senate, and others who have chief responsibility.

We pray for our comrades in the task of world brotherhood, especially for those whose lives are exposed to great danger, for their families and all their interests.

May the blessing of God rest this day upon the bereaved family of Thy servant, who had led a great Christian church in our midst, upon his people, and upon all others who mourn his loss.

We pray for the nations of earth who differ from us in thought and purpose. In the midst of strife may we learn nobility of character which shall be free from unholy prejudice and vindictive passion. In the name of the Great Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 163) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 37, and 41 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 5 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien;

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.;

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States;

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1933, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Andrews	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	Nye
Bailey	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Pepper
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Buck	Holman	Reynolds
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	La Follette	Scruggs
Byrd	Langer	Shipstead
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Caraway	Lucas	Stewart
Chandler	McCarran	Taft
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Danaher	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Van Nuys
George	Mullikin	Wallgren
Gerry	Moore	Walsh

Wheeler White Willis
Wherry Wiley Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ACQUISITION, CONVERSION, OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE NAVY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2; and agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,

M. E. TYDINGS,

JAMES J. DAVIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

P. H. DREWRY,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

MELVIN J. MAAS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PRODUCTION OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be per-

mitted to read a letter which I have just received from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, dealing with farm machinery. It is a very short letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,

Washington, D. C., June 9, 1943.

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SCOTT: I am happy to inform you that a substantially increased program for the production of farm machinery will get under way July 1.

A total of 300,000 tons of carbon steel, with other materials in proportion, has been allocated to the farm machinery program for the quarter beginning July 1. To assure continuous and balanced production, advance authorizations totalling an additional 200,000 tons of steel have also been approved for each of the three quarters from October 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944.

During the third quarter of this year, special emphasis will be given to the manufacture of harvesting machinery for this year's crops.

The total authorizations for the quarter and for the year beginning July 1 will make it possible to meet the farm machinery production program requested by the War Food Administration.

Within a few days the War Production Board will issue a new farm machinery order to replace L-170, under which the industry has been operating. Farm equipment manufacturers are being authorized today by telegram to place orders for materials for the new program. The telegrams include allotment numbers under the Controlled Materials Plan which will make it possible for the companies to place authorized orders immediately. Detailed certificates of authorization will be mailed within a few days.

In order to assure adequate production, distribution, maintenance, and repair facilities, the new order will eliminate the concentration features of L-170. It will provide for production of new machinery at approximately 80 percent of the 1940 level.

The whole farm machinery program has been stepped up by advancing the completion dates for the quotas established in L-170 for the year which began October 1, 1942, and placing the farm machinery industry on a new annual basis beginning July 1. Of the 300,000 tons of carbon steel allotted for the third quarter of this year, 83,723 tons will be used for completion of the increased program of harvesting machinery decided upon in March, and the remainder will constitute first quarter authorizations under the new order.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS BY SELECTIVE SERVICE LOCAL BOARDS BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of registrants who have been deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on May 15, 1943, and stating that "a supplemental report will be submitted as soon as possible for those registrants in the 80 remaining local boards in continental United States and the local boards in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy (8) and Agriculture (14), and the Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of McLouth, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

Three memorials of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 8

"A memorial requesting Congress to continue the appropriation for the work of the Farm Security Administration

"Whereas the Farm Security Administration is rendering a much needed service to a great underprivileged class of our citizens; and

"Whereas no other agency, either governmental or private, will properly assume the task of elevating this large group to financial stability and responsible citizenship; and

"Whereas the need for more and more food and related farm produce will be best served by continuing this worthy agency: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America in its wisdom continue the appropriations for the activities of the Farm Security Administration; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida be immediately forwarded by the secretary of State to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Florida, and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

"House Memorial 10

"Memorial endorsing the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929

"Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United

States Congress a bill providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929; and

"Whereas it is just and equitable that the persons who suffered loss as aforesaid should be compensated for such loss; and

"Whereas such relief should be provided by an act of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby unanimously endorse the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929 and requests the Members of Congress to enact the same into law.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

"House Memorial 14

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States petitioning the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for cooperative forest extension and fire protection and for the continuance of funds for forest research

"Whereas the extension of good forestry practices is essential to the continuing supply of vital forest products; and

"Whereas continuance of cooperative forest fire protection is likewise essential to the future of our forest products; and

"Whereas experimental forest research continues to add to the value of forest and forest products: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress be petitioned to appropriate the full amount of \$4,000,000 recommended by the House Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee and an additional \$3,000,000 to provide fire protection for interior military establishments; and be it further

"Resolved, That Norris-Doxey funds be appropriated to the amount of at least \$500,000 and that the United States Forest Service funds be increased by \$500,000 for the continuance of the experimental forest research; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of Florida be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida to each of the Senators and Representatives of Florida in the Congress of the United States of America.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Whereas because of unfavorable weather conditions, a late freeze necessitating replanting in many cases and because of increased costs of fertilizer and seed, as well as of labor, and of every other movement incidental to planting, growing, and harvesting this season's crop of Irish potatoes; and

"Whereas the so-called ceiling price of the incoming crop of Florida potatoes, as set by the Office of Price Administration, is not sufficient to meet the added costs, as above enumerated, and is certainly not in line with the prices allowed and named on other essential food products: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the senate and of the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Florida, do respectfully memorialize and petition the

Office of Price Administration in the recommendation that a substantial increase be ordered in the ceiling price of new Florida potatoes comparable with prices fixed on other vegetable food products, and to make possible a reasonable financial return to the growers to compensate them for their work, time, and labor in food production as a valuable contribution to sustain our citizens, our workers, and soldiers in the all-out effort toward winning the war; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Office of Price Administration, the Federal Department of Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the governor May 22, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on the Library:

"House Memorial 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting that provision be made for the establishment of a national monument at the site of Fort Caroline at St. Johns Bluff, on the south side of the St. Johns River, about 5 miles from the mouth of said river

"Whereas St. Johns Bluff and the area immediately adjacent thereto is of tremendous historical interest, yet has been ignored and neglected by United States Government for some inexplicable reason; and

"Whereas this was the site of Fort Caroline, a colony and fortification established by the French in 1564, was the birthplace of the first Protestant white child on the North American Continent, was the site of the first battle between the armed forces of two European nations in the New World, when the Spaniards, under Pedro Menendez, captured the fort, killing most of the French garrison, and of the battle 2 years later when the French, under DeGourges, recaptured the fort, killing most of the Spanish garrison, and it is probably the only spot in the United States which was actually fortified by five different nations—France, Spain, England, the Confederate States of America, and the United States of America; and

"Whereas this site is a place of great natural beauty: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to establish the Fort Caroline National Monument at St. Johns Bluff, in Duval County, Fla., as a part of the post-war program for recreational centers; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to each of Florida's Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the National Park Service, and to each member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; said copies to be under the great seal of the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Memorial 12

"To the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

"Whereas it is very necessary that war industry not be stopped for any cause for the duration; and

"Whereas the coal industry is important and vital to the welfare of this country, and to the armed forces, and necessary for our victory over the barbarians of the world; and

"Whereas it is important that workers, miners, and employees at similar work stay on the job; and

"Whereas many miners and other workers have sons and daughters in the armed forces; and

"Whereas it is detrimental to the morale of the armed forces to have workers quit their jobs during this time; and

"Whereas our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has met this emergency with his usual good judgment and appeal to the patriotism of the workingman: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives and senate concurring, That the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, be commended by the Legislature of the State of Florida for his handling of the miner's problem, and for his radio broadcast appeal to the patriotism of the miners, and for his action in the emergency.

"That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this session, and that a copy be forwarded to the President and our Representatives and Senators in Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FLORIDA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PEPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas millions of the flower of American youth are now engaged in a life and death struggle for the very preservation of our system of government; and

Whereas when the complete victory has been accomplished many of these men will return home to begin life anew and will undoubtedly face serious problems of rehabilitation brought on by this global struggle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in annual war conference assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., does take cognizance of the foregoing facts and does hereby recommend that the Congress of these United States immediately provide the proper means for the preparation of a competent rehabilitation program to aid and assist these returning civilians of tomorrow to the end that they may once again take their rightful places in our democratic economy.

Whereas the United States of America is now engaged in a total war against the Axis countries; and

Whereas to win this war it is the duty of every person or groups of persons who enjoy the freedom, privileges, and protection of our country to support loyally and patriotically the Government in the all-out effort for victory; and

Whereas a strike during war is a strike against the Government, and regardless of the apparent right to strike such action is dangerous, ill-advised, and unpatriotic, resulting in disunity, crippling of production, and consequent loss of countless lives of our soldiers at the front; and

Whereas John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America called a strike of all miners, thus repudiating a solemn no-strike pledge made to the President of the United States in December 1941: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in annual session assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., deplores and condemns this arbitrary, unpatriotic action of John L. Lewis as an effort to force the Government to accede to his demands without submitting to orderly democratic arbitration through the proper Government channels; be it further

Resolved, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce does support and commend the President of the United States as Commander in Chief for reopening production of these vital mines under the flag of the United States of America.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1158. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 293); and

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 294).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 369. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1046. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; without amendment (Rept. No. 296).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1403. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 297).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 298); and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 299).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1171. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1172. A bill to authorize a payment to the widow and minor children of the late Commander Howard W. Gilmore, United States Navy, as a token of the appreciation of the people of the United States for his heroic sacrifice of his life; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1173. A bill to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1174. A bill for the relief of William L. O'Brien; and

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Margaret Barnes Shank; to the Committee on Finance. (Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bills Nos. 1176 to 1216, inclusive, which were referred to the appropriate committees, and appear under separate headings.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or

ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler"; and

H. R. 2768. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An Act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; and

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

RESOLUTIONS OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA—PROPOSED VETERANS' LEGISLATION—BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution from the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, requesting "First things first." The resolutions committee is composed of Neal E. Williams, chairman, Norman G. Charboneaux, Fred Gonglie, Herb Turner, and Fay DeWitt, all of whom have been officers of the Disabled War Veterans, Department of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted by the same organization to uniformize administrative provisions concerning, and to remove, present inequalities as between various similar groups of disabled veterans and their dependents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, setting forth:

That this convention pledge its support to the national organization and go on record before the national organization as recommending that that organization take steps to train and maintain a Veterans' Service representative in each Veterans' Administration facility in the United States, and in States like North Dakota where a Veterans' Service commissioner is maintained by law, said Veterans' Service representative of this organization be instructed to assist such Veterans' Service commissioner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted by the same organization to provide for a method by which able-bodied persons, now performing jobs which can be satisfactorily performed by handicapped persons, can be replaced in such jobs by handicapped persons, including America's disabled defenders, so as to release them for other essential employment or service—important to the Nation's determination to win World War No. 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER presented the following resolutions adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, the titles of which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and the resolutions were referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

Resolution requesting that immediate priorities be granted for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak.;

Resolution protesting against the presumption that if a veteran of World War No. 2 does not have more than 6 months' service, that his disability did exist prior to service;

Resolution pledging all members of the Department of North Dakota to purchase War Savings bonds and stamps and other debentures of the Government to promote the war effort;

Resolution authorizing and directing the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans to confer with other national officers and other veteran organizations relative to taking steps looking to the enactment of legislation and provision for such executive orders and other plans as may be designed to provide for the full, suitable, gainful employment of all returning war veterans of World War No. 2;

Resolution to provide for a minimum rating of permanent partial 10 percent for any war veteran who was wounded or gassed in active service;

Resolution to extend eligibility for pension to the dependent widows and children of deceased war veterans who, at time of death, were suffering with a disability traceable to an examination, treatment, or hospitalization of such veteran;

Resolution to provide more effective preferences for veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities and for their wives and

widows as to all governmental jobs for which they are qualified;

Resolution to provide an increase in the pension payable to the dependent widows and children of war veterans who at the time of death were suffering from some service-connected disability;

A resolution to provide for continued insurance protection for veterans who have received insurance benefits for 240 months or more, who thereafter have been rated less than permanently and totally disabled;

A resolution to provide that Government insurance policies shall be incontestable, subsequent to one year after date of issuance, reinstatement or conversion and that all premiums paid in on all policies canceled by the Veterans' Administration shall be returned to the veteran or to his next of kin;

Resolution to liberalize the law as to forfeitures;

Resolution to provide that basic ratings of disabilities shall be increased by 20 percent thereof for each additional 5 years of age after the age of 40, in determining the amount of compensation to be granted to service connected disabled veterans;

Resolution requesting legislation, in effect to provide that the amounts of compensation and pension payable to disabled veterans, and the dependents of disabled veterans, shall automatically be increased or decreased by 10 percent for each 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above or below that of the calendar year 1940, to be used as the basic period, provided, however, that such basic compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic rates provided by law;

Resolution to provide for a minimum rating of 1 percent in all cases where a veteran was noted, at time of discharge, as having some disability;

Resolution to provide that so-called "misconduct" shall be a bar to the receipt of compensation or pension to disabled veterans only where the disability was due to "felonious misconduct";

Resolution to provide full compensation for the so-called "presumptives";

Resolution to provide for adjudication of pending claims after death of veteran;

Resolution to permit suit on any automatic, yearly renewable term or United States Life Insurance policy at any time;

Resolution to increase up to \$60 per month the death compensation payable to widows of war veterans who have died by reason of service connected disabilities;

Resolution to provide a pension of \$60 per month to any war veteran who is permanently and totally disabled by reason of a disability not established to be service connected;

Resolution to extend the period of time before which to make application for adjusted compensation from January 2, 1940, up to January 2, 1950;

Resolution to provide for retroactive adjudication of equitable claims;

Resolution to provide for a reduction of interest on Government insurance loans, from 5 percent to 3½ percent;

Resolution requiring that permanent total disability shall be determined on the basis of the inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation;

Resolution requesting removal of all limitation dates before which to make application for various types of benefits for veterans and their dependents;

Resolution to authorize payment of compensation for partial service-connected disability plus the percentage of pension for permanent total disability (nonservice) equal to the difference between 100 percent and his degree of service-connected disability;

Resolution to provide for dependency allowances to be payable to veterans receiving compensation or pension on the basis of permanent ratings;

Resolution to provide full payment of compensation or pension to single veterans while hospitalized;

Resolution to provide eligibility for adjusted compensation to any World War provisional, temporary or probationary commissioned or warrant officer below rank of major;

Resolution to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud, or clear or unmistakable error, reduce any permanent disability rating;

Resolution to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connections and compensation;

Resolution to provide prosthetic and orthopedic appliances needed for any war veteran;

Resolution to extend the time within which to make an appeal from decisions of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration;

Resolution to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration until modified by court order; and

Resolution requesting amendment to National Service Life Insurance Act to provide insurance benefits for total disability.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolution requesting legislation to provide for the fingerprinting of all persons within the United States;

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolution to remove the Statute of Limitations as to claims for Emergency Officers' Retirement benefits;

Resolution to provide for Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Boards of Appeals and Reviews, with authority to grant honorable discharge certificates to veterans previously discharged dishonorably or without honor;

Resolution to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Cemetery in every State; and

Resolution to the Congress, urging enactment of legislation requiring the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officials to furnish each soldier, sailor, or marine upon discharge or immediately thereafter copy of medical record.

To the Committee on Pensions:

Resolution to provide the same amount of pension for the widows and children and dependent parents of war veterans who were permanently and totally disabled in combat, but who have died by reason of some other disability, as if they had died by reason of such combat disability; and

Resolution to extend eligibility for pension to the widow of any veteran, otherwise eligible, if she was married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death, or if, being married, she gave birth to a child by the veteran.

Ordered to lie on the table:

Resolution expressing appreciation to Past Commanders C. T. Hoverson and Walter Johnson, manager and veterans' contact officer of Veterans' Bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., and also to Dr. P. A. Waters, Veterans' Bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., for their counsel and guidance on the many problems before the Disabled American Veterans convention.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask consent to introduce for proper reference a number of bills prepared by the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bills introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

(For the bills introduced today by Mr. LANGER, see the end of Mr. LANGER's remarks.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the first bill is entitled "A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering."

I may add, Mr. President, that the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota is a very active body, perhaps the most active of any organization in the United States. Realizing that the Disabled War Veterans were not receiving a square deal, and also that some of the other veterans, in their judgment, were not receiving the kind of deal to which they were entitled, they asked that I prepare certain bills for them. Some of these bills they prepared themselves. With respect to others I assisted in the preparation.

The second bill is entitled "A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits."

The third bill is entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in national service life insurance policies."

The fourth bill is entitled "A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order."

The fifth bill is entitled "A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces."

The sixth bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10."

The seventh bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator."

The eighth bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities but whose death resulted from other causes."

The ninth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof."

The tenth bill is entitled "A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error."

The eleventh bill is entitled "A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers."

The twelfth bill is entitled "A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent."

The thirteenth bill is entitled "A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children."

The fourteenth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize payment of pensions at

combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities."

The fifteenth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota."

The sixteenth bill is entitled "A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes."

The seventeenth bill is entitled "A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis."

The eighteenth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability."

The nineteenth bill is entitled "A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ per centum."

The twentieth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications."

The twenty-first bill is entitled "A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950."

The twenty-second bill is entitled "A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from \$40 to \$60 per month."

The twenty-third bill is entitled "A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies."

The twenty-fourth bill is entitled "A bill to increase to \$60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities."

The twenty-fifth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran."

The twenty-sixth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 per centum of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 per centum thereof, and for other purposes."

The twenty-seventh bill is entitled "A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct."

The twenty-eighth bill is entitled "A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans."

The twenty-ninth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension pay-

ments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 per centum for every 10 per centum increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first six months of 1940, as computed each six months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes."

The thirtieth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 per centum of the basic amounts, payable for each five years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes."

The thirty-first bill is entitled "A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents."

The thirty-second bill is entitled "A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after one year, and for other purposes."

The thirty-third bill is entitled "A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes."

The thirty-fourth bill is entitled "A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law Numbered 484, Seventy-third Congress), as amended, and for other purposes."

The thirty-fifth bill is entitled "A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed."

The thirty-sixth bill is entitled "A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment."

The thirty-seventh bill is entitled "A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions."

The thirty-eighth bill is entitled "A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions."

The thirty-ninth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for a statutory award of \$10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes."

And the fortieth bill is entitled "A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for

receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War."

Mr. President, I wish to state that, as I have said before, all the bills were carefully drawn by the disabled war veterans of the State of North Dakota. After having gone over them and examined them with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau, there does not seem to be any disputing the fact that the disabled war veterans of the United States have not been receiving the kind of treatment to which they feel they are entitled, and to which I think they are entitled, in view of the fact that they were disabled in World War No. 1.

The bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1176. A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering;

S. 1177. A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits;

S. 1178. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in National Service Life Insurance policies; and

S. 1179. A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1180. A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1181. A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10;

S. 1182. A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator;

S. 1183. A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities, but whose death resulted from other causes;

S. 1184. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof;

S. 1185. A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error;

S. 1186. A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers;

S. 1187. A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent;

S. 1188. A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children; and

S. 1189. A bill to authorize payment of pensions at combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1190. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1191. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identifica-

tion cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis;

S. 1193. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability;

S. 1194. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent;

S. 1195. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications;

S. 1196. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950;

S. 1197. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from \$40 to \$60 per month;

S. 1198. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies;

S. 1199. A bill to increase to \$60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities;

S. 1200. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran;

S. 1201. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1202. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

S. 1203. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1205. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents;

S. 1207. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes;

S. 1208. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled and for other purposes; and

S. 1209. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the Act of June

28, 1934 (Public Law No. 484, 73d Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1210. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1211. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1212. A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1213. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1214. A bill to provide for a statutory award of \$10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1215. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also introduce a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," so as to increase by \$300 the amount of additional compensation payable under such act. I introduce the bill for the reason that I find, upon investigation, that the letter carriers and some of the other postal employees are not receiving sufficient pay, in view of the increased cost of living, to enable them to maintain a decent standard of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1216) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," so as to increase by \$300 the amount of additional compensation payable under such act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

VICTORY ON THE HOME FRONT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Victory on the Home Front," delivered by him June 7, 1943, before the Central Retail Feed Association, Inc., at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHECK-UP OF THE FOOD FRONT—ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Check-Up of the Food Front," delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover at the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting on June 8, 1943, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RAIL- ROADS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the 1937 accomplishments of the traffic department of the American Association of Railroads, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME SUBSIDIES—ARTICLE FROM BUSINESS WEEK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wartime Subsidies," published in the May 22, 1943, issue of Business Week, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRITICAL CANNED-FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments in order to speak on a subject which I believe merits the attention of this body. I have just returned from my State of Wisconsin. There I found a condition which is truly tragic. The canning factories of the country are having difficult times. My State under normal conditions cans about 36 percent of the peas canned in the Nation. If the pea crop in other States this year does not improve, we in Wisconsin may be called upon to can in the neighborhood of from 40 percent to 45 percent of the total crop. The help problem, of course, arises from the war situation. Help in canning factories, which ordinarily would be paid from 40 to 50 cents an hour during the seasonal period, has all been taken into the war plants. In the war plants the workers are paid from \$1.10 an hour up. The result is that we are likely to lose a great deal of very vital food. How important is that food? Mr. President, let me refer to an article I have before me which was published by the Milwaukee Journal, reprinted from the New York Times. The article indicates that the defeat in Tunisia of the Germans and Italians was due in no small measure to the fact that the Germans were undernourished. They had plenty of food, mind you, but they did not have the cooked food. They had plenty of ammunition. What they lacked was the nourishment which comes from cooked food, canned food. Our boys who did such a fine job had canned, cooked food.

I simply want to take a moment to read a paragraph or two from the article. The article was written by Frank L. Kluckhohn:

But what we are most interested in here is that, far from fighting to the last cartridge, these Germans surrendered with boxes of ammunition in quantity, neatly stacked under trees, at Cap Bon. And that they marched in with enough food to last them a long while—our chief difficulty in feeding them with it has been that their rations are uncooked, whereas most of our front-line rations come prepared in cans. It was not alone that the Germans marched in briskly in military formations to give themselves up rather than face the destruction of their outfits to save time for Adolf Hitler, who sent troops into Africa as late as May 5.

Now let me read another paragraph:

Most of the Hitlerites were despondent when they came in. After a square meal many of them expressed the view that they were going to beat us in the war. The way they had acted was forgotten. They talked

of being "tired" of war when they came in. They talked of victory after being fed.

They did not talk of victory before they were fed. They surrendered. After they had received a square meal of American rations, cooked rations, they talked of victory, the article says.

The paragraph concludes:

A major, who had entered the German Army when he was 15, said he was glad to have his fighting over.

Mr. President, last week, before I returned to my State, there came to my office representatives of the canneries of the State. They were rather dejected. They want to do all they can do. I put them in contact with Marvin Jones. One of the issues is, Can they raise their wage 10 cents an hour? Since the men in the plants in the neighborhood are receiving \$1.10 an hour, where else would anyone want to work? However, this problem involves more than the interests of the canners, more than the interests of the State of Wisconsin. It goes to the very question of whether we shall win the war. Food will win. The lack of food will defeat us.

I read a paragraph from a letter which I received this morning from William Opitz, of the Elkhorn Canning Co., who is a patriotic citizen:

We must make Washington realize, before it is too late, that canned foods are the No. 1 munition of war. No food and you need no shells, cannon, tanks, airplanes. You can kill more people by starvation than any mechanical device that man can produce.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. In connection with the matter which the Senator is discussing, let me say that I received two letters from the parents of boys in New Guinea. One of them wrote to his folks saying that he could not understand why the people in the United States were being rationed. He said that the boys were not getting any American food. He said that they were getting Australian beef, which was rather poor, but 10 American canned goods. He said that the Australian canned beans and some other articles were all right, but that most of the canned goods were of very poor grade. This soldier, writing to his parents, said that he had not been paid for 5 months. He said that the boys could buy all the American food they wanted in the canteens, but that they were not being furnished American food.

I took up the question with the War Department and was informed that the Department would immediately take it up by wire with the authorities in New Guinea. The War Department officials said that there was no reason why the boys should not get American food.

As I have said, I received two letters, one from a boy's parents in Billings, Mont., and one from a boy's parents in Helena, Mont. Both of them told exactly the same story.

So far as the farmers in my State are concerned, I have received no complaint from them with reference to the prices of their products; but there is this question: If we are to get plenty of food we must have labor. I read a statement by Mr. Hoover and one by the Governor of New York to the effect that they fear that there will be a food shortage. Other persons have told me that there is bound to be a food shortage. If we are to bring about a greater production of canned goods, we must have labor. We must give the farmer a price such that he can furnish the materials with which to produce the food. It seems to me it is a short-sighted policy to say that we will not give the farmer or the canner a price sufficient to pay his workers so that the workers can be kept on the farm or in the factory.

Complaints in similar vein to the complaint cited by the Senator from Wisconsin have come from the canners of my State.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I do not know whether our canned goods are going through to Australia. I do know that under the lend-lease arrangement Australia is giving a great deal of food to our boys there. Lend-lease there is a two-way street, and, so far as I know, there is no complaint as to the quality or quantity of food which the boys are getting.

I am not speaking on that point. I am stressing the point that the Senate of the United States can no longer "pass the buck." For some years we have been talking about the need of a war cabinet. We have sensed that an over-all authority was needed. We need someone at the head who can make the final decision. We hoped that when Jimmie Byrnes was appointed as "assistant President" the war cabinet would go into action. The trouble in the past has been that someone decides what the wages shall be; someone else decides this thing or that thing, but they are in different departments, and there is no person having over-all authority. Here is hoping Byrnes will coordinate this whole matter—wages, prices, priorities, and so forth.

Mr. President, in the next few weeks the question of whether or not certain crops are to be preserved in this country must be decided. It will be decided by the action which is taken in relation to providing labor for the factories.

Three weeks ago when I was in the West there had been heavy rains in Indiana, Ohio, and other States. Much of the land was under water. On my return trip yesterday and this morning I was glad to see that a great deal of that land is coming through in fine shape. Of course, the corn is behind. That means a delay in canning and production in that area.

However, let me stick to the point which I am making. I repeat the language of Mr. Opitz, of the Elkhorn Canning Co.:

We must make Washington realize, before it is too late, that canned foods are the No. 1 munition of war.

What are we going to do? What is Congress going to do about it? What is

Marvin Jones going to do about it? What are the authorities at the other end of the Avenue going to do? Are they going to neglect the problem? If they do, we may find our boys in the same situation as were the Germans in north Africa. They had plenty of munitions, plenty of food, but not plenty of guts. Why? Because they did not have cooked food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANS WILL QUIT! LESSON OF TUNISIA—THEY WERE NOT OUT OF AMMUNITION OR FOOD, BUT WHEN THEY SAW THEY WERE TO BE DEFEATED THEY CAVED IN QUICKLY

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS IN NORTH AFRICA.—Why did the German and Italian troops in Africa suddenly collapse after 6 months of sturdy battling against the Allied forces? In the answer to this question one can find many lessons of prime importance for the future. All of us who saw the Germans in action knew that technically they were as expert as any troops could be. They used tanks, artillery and antitank guns, men, and airplanes almost perfectly. They seemed to those opposing them to be as courageous as any soldiers that could be found. Yet suddenly they went to pieces. Why?

The Germans were beaten militarily by superior fire power. They were mauled by Allied planes with complete control of the air, but this does not tell the whole story. This is that they collapsed, that they gave up when they saw the odds were overwhelmingly against them. When it came to the showdown they did not after all have the inspiration of the men of Bataan, the willingness to die for a lost cause and gain vital time, that the Russians showed at Stalingrad. There was something wrong. We know what it was and that is the point of this report.

NOT A MATTER OF NUMBERS

When it is said they bowed to superior fire power, that does not mean they were overwhelmed by numbers. The official count of prisoners shows that 200,000 Axis soldiers, at least two-thirds of them Germans, were captured, in addition to those who died, row on row, as the Americans drove into Bizerte and the British into Tunis. In the actual line, Gen. Sir Harold R. L. G. Alexander probably did not have a number greatly in excess of that.

Thousands of pieces of artillery of all types, hundreds of intact implements of warfare like tanks were taken. The odds were not terribly uneven on paper. When one talks of superior fire power one means that the Allied tanks were better concentrated than the German, that the American artillery and British, too, were far more effective than that of the enemy, that our boys were willing to die—and many of them did—to bring to bear the small-arm fire necessary to get to their objective. These were Allied troops—British, American, French—seasoned by long months of fighting the Germans, to beat them at their own game.

OUTGENERATED ARNIM AND CAPTURED HIM

That only steel thrown faster than the Germans can hurl it would beat the superb masters of warfare most informed Americans have long known, but when the Germans came in as prisoners and asked to see our "automatic" big guns, it showed that the novel American method of employing artill-

ery had them on their heels. When our Infantry charge sheer 2,000-foot cliffs and drove the Germans out it was because they could throw more lead than the enemy in a superior position.

When Col. Gen. Jurgen von Arnim was captured not so far from Enfidaville, it demonstrated that he had been outgeneraled—General Alexander had held important elements of the Axis army there by the mere name of the Eighth Army, while he transferred three of its divisions to the First Army farther north for the knock-out blow.

It is indeed good news that we can outshoot, outfought, and outgeneral the opposition. No one here thinks that the inevitable entry into Europe is going to be anything but hard or that the battle afterward is going to be any easier than the long, difficult struggle in Tunisia. It is dangerous to be over-optimistic because of what has happened.

NAZI INVINCIBILITY?

But in this Tunisian campaign we have shown that the Germans can be beaten in their chosen field—battle—just as they were in 1918. We have proved that Nazi invincibility is a myth.

We have learned, moreover, all the Nazi tricks in using tanks, placing guns, and employing whatever one has most effectively. After we had learned what the Germans knew, we improved our methods and invented tricks of our own.

But what we are most interested in here is that, far from fighting to the last cartridge, these Germans surrendered with boxes of ammunition in quantity, neatly stacked under trees at Cap Bon. And that they marched in with enough food to last them a long while—our chief difficulty in feeding them with it has been that their rations are uncooked, whereas most of our front-line rations come prepared in cans. It was not alone that the Germans marched in briskly in military formations to give themselves up rather than face the destruction of their outfits to save time for Adolf Hitler, who sent troops into Africa as late as May 5.

What is important also is that Prussian generals tried to escape in small boats, or burst into tears after capture; that Germans marched in making the "V" for victory sign, hoping this would please the British and Americans; that others fought over the chance to get away in the limited number of small boats available—most of which subsequently were destroyed; that, in brief, they cracked.

LIKE A FOX ROMMEL RAN

Maybe Field Marshal Gen. Erwin Rommel, who left his men at some time yet to be definitely determined, was ill. That would be a natural thing for the German propaganda machine to say of this national idol. Marshal Rommel was the fox—and like the fox, he ran. Generals have commanded battles from a litter.

No one can minimize the tremendous part the British Navy and Allied air forces played in keeping supplies away from the Axis here, yet the forces of Der Fuehrer and Il Duce had ammunition and food when they gave in. It is on the record that a week was counted on to get from Medjez el Bab to Tunis, yet it took only a day and a half after the planes blasted a way open, smashing gun and infantry positions with concentrated bombing. But the Russians have taken the same sort of bombing, and I saw British and American troops stand up against hourly bombings for days on end in the early stages of this campaign.

Let us boil it down to a fact that the Germans did not fight well with the odds against them. Many of them, moreover, were the Germans who appeared to many invincible when they crushed Poland, France, and Greece with the odds in their favor. That is what it comes down to. When the typical

German becomes convinced that he cannot win, he will not fight.

NOT LIKE OUR MEN

Can the reader imagine American troops surrendering by units and when they found that the enemy did not have men available to guard them, marching docilely to the rear? I remember those Hampshire men who died in such numbers near Tebourba that only a few were left. They did not yield a yard. This was against superior numbers with no support in sight. I remember the Americans at Kasserine, out on their feet from weeks of steady and unfavorable fighting, men who thought strongly, perhaps, that they were being misused, who stood their ground though many were killed, and finally turned the tide.

Most of the Hitlerites were despondent when they came in. After a square meal many of them expressed the view that they were going to beat us in the war. The way they had acted was forgotten. They talked of being "tired" of war when they came in. They talked of victory after being fed. A major, who had entered the German Army when he was 15, said he was glad to have his fighting over. Someone asked, "When will the war be over?"

LACKS REAL CONVICTION

"I cannot say," he replied in English. "It may take us 5 or 6 months to recapture Africa."

Summing up, from what I can gather the German has been schooled in war and has fought until his enthusiasm has gone. He is a perfect soldier with regard to technique, both individually and en masse. He is brave enough when he thinks he stands a chance to win, but he lacks the conviction of men with real ideals. He seems to have none of the will to fight when all appears lost that sometimes turns defeat into victory, or at least into glory.

It does not really matter what these men think of Herr Hitler. It is important that the Hitler system has not given them "what it takes."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said this week the Allies could find "hope" in what has happened here. We who have seen something of the dirt and blood, who have felt the extreme discomforts of front-line life, who know the nerve-shattering effects of today's high explosives, who have watched the Germans fight, know we have a long, hard row ahead, but we know that if we can pay the price the German military machine will crack. It may be expected to be a high price, but the Nazis will not fight to the bitter end.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89 it is proposed to strike out lines 4 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and

means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, \$29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semi-annually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making my grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to

have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the question of subsidies was discussed yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and is being generally discussed by a great many persons throughout the country, I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of June 3, 1943.

It will be recalled that the publisher of the Chicago Daily News is the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the Cabinet.

The editorial states:

IT BUTTERS NO PARSNIPS

The Office of Price Administration's roll-back on retail butter prices is hailed as a blow at the rising cost of living. The housewife who paid 46 cents a pound for butter can now buy the same grade for 41 cents. It's wonderful. It's all done with mirrors.

In order to accomplish this boon to suffering humanity, the butter producer or wholesaler is forced by law to sell the butter to the retailer at 5 cents a pound less than the former price.

I do not know of any law which requires it. I think it is an edict of the department.

The editorial continues:

He, in turn, will be subsidized by the Government at the rate of 5 cents a pound. He will make as much money on the transaction as formerly, the new dealers point out; the retailer will make as much as formerly; the consumer will be benefited by a saving of 5 cents a pound. It is as simple as all that. But is it?

That 5-cents-a-pound subsidy paid to the wholesaler must come from somewhere. Can it be possible that it comes, via the United States Treasury, out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country—the people who buy butter and those who can't afford butter but have to be content with oleomargarine? Could be.

And what about the elaborate machinery that will have to be set up to enforce and administer this system, police the retailers and the wholesalers, keep the accounts, write out the subsidy checks, deliver them to the wholesalers, compile the reports and statistics inevitable in such a Nation-wide activity? Will this complicated machinery require the employment of many clerks and accountants and stenographers and typists and regional directors and superdirectors? The answer is, "Yes." And will these Government employees be paid salaries and wages for their services? You said it, brother, they will.

The roll-back is, therefore, merely an optical illusion. The consumer, instead of paying 46 cents a pound for butter over the counter, will pay 41 cents over the counter. Then, sooner or later, he will pay out of another pocket the 5-cent subsidy that goes to the wholesaler, plus a few cents additional in taxation to pay for the army of Government employees necessary to administer the device.

Instead of rolling back the price of butter and lowering the cost of living, the subsidy plan, by increasing the administrative load that the consumer must support, will increase the ultimate cost of butter.

The Office of Price Administration may call it a roll-back now; but eventually it will be a kick-back.

I wish to compliment the Secretary of the Navy for this very able editorial

which appears in his newspaper, the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator from Montana that the editorial is an able one; but the Senator does not believe that the Secretary of the Navy really wrote the editorial, or knew it appeared, or had anything to do with it, does he?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he wrote it or not.

Mr. HILL. My understanding is that since Mr. Knox became Secretary of the Navy he turned the management of his newspaper and its policies, as well as its program, over to certain of his partners and employees. So I really think the Senator, however much he might agree with the editorial, is according the Secretary of the Navy a tribute which I doubt the Secretary of the Navy deserves in this particular instance. I question whether the Secretary of the Navy had anything to do with the editorial.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he had anything to do with it, and I do not believe that my friend, the acting majority leader, knows whether he had anything to do with it. But, whether he had anything to do with it or not, I agree with the editorial thoroughly, and if the Secretary of the Navy was responsible for it, he should be complimented for it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think in fairness to the Secretary of the Navy it should be said that merely because the editorial is a good one it should not be assumed that the Secretary of the Navy did not write it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, being a newspaperman, ought to know that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in addition to what the Chicago Daily News has said in the editorial which I have just read, I wish to say that I am opposed to the granting of subsidies on another ground. I am not saying this because it is being done by a Democratic administration. I am opposed to it in principle. Sooner or later the people of this country must realize that when prices are rolled back and subsidies are granted the money for such subsidies must come out of the pockets of the people in the way of taxes. I agree with the statement made in the editorial that there will have to be provided another army of Federal employees and bureaucrats to check up on all the various stores. The final result will be that it will cost the American people more money than it would cost to permit the consumers to continue to pay the prices which they are paying at the present time.

Furthermore, subsidies are bad in theory, a bad principle, in a democratic republic, because politicians, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, will say to farmers, merchants, and this group and that group, "If the opposition comes into power, you will not receive this subsidy." If various groups of the people are put under obligation to the Government, sooner or later, if this program

continues and this group is to be subsidized and that group is to be subsidized, and some other group is to be subsidized, it will not be long before all the people of the country will be on some kind of a subsidy. When that is done the principles of democracy in a democratic republic will be in danger.

Other forms of government may do it. It has been pointed out that England has done it. But it must be recalled that the British Isles are a much smaller territory than this vast country of ours.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. It also ought to be realized that the British Government is the importer of 90 percent of the food which the people there eat; and, of course, it is easy for that Government, as the importer of 90 or 95 percent of the food products coming into Great Britain, to grant a subsidy by a reduction in the price to the food distributors. But that is no reason why it would work in a country such as ours, under a proposal which seeks to deal with the production and processing of food products. It seems to me that those who have assumed that, because it works in Great Britain to check inflationary price rises, it would work in this country, have wholly left out of consideration the vast difference between what is here proposed and the situation in England.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the observations of the Senator from Georgia. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Montana to this aspect: The sinister part of the subsidy program is that the administration is not coming to the Congress for authority to pay subsidies. It is going to the R. F. C., and the various other corporations which have been created by the Government. A subsidy program has already been instituted in this country when Congress on at least two occasions, has said that no subsidy should be paid.

Furthermore, when Mr. Jesse Jones was before the Joint Committee for the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures he testified that the R. F. C., without any authority of law whatever, had already agreed to pay \$450,000,000 in subsidies on meat and butter, to the processors, not to the farmers. The big packers are the ones who are to receive the subsidies.

The Senator is probably aware that some time ago Mr. Henderson testified it would cost \$5,000,000,000 to put the subsidy program in operation. It will result in complete regimentation of all the farmers and processors of food. As the Senator has said, the \$5,000,000,000 must be raised through taxation of future generations at a time when they will be less able to pay than are the people today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Georgia called attention to the fact that the situation in England is different from ours

because most of its food is imported. I think it should be stated that a large part of the food imported is obtained through lend-lease from the United States Government, and that the food is then sold to the British people. Pounds sterling are received by the British Government, which, of course, are of no value to us, and are not paid to us. They are available to the British to pay subsidies on foodstuffs acquired elsewhere than in the United States. So not only is the situation different in England, but the subsidy there is paid at our expense instead of that of the British Government.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there is a bill on the calendar, Senate bill 1108, Calendar No. 289, which has been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, containing an amendment prohibiting the use of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the payment of subsidies. When that bill comes before the Senate I intend to offer, if no other Senator does, an amendment imposing a general prohibition against the use of R. F. C. money, or any other money, for subsidies, except under certain specified conditions, where Congress may have approved the policy, or where it may desire to approve the policy. I hope the Senator from Montana will support such a movement which will bring this question directly to issue in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator need not worry about my supporting it, for I certainly shall do so.

I also call attention to the fact that when subsidies are granted to various industries and various sections people who may never use the particular article are called upon to pay their share of the subsidy so that someone else may obtain the article at a cheaper price. Take, for instance, a subsidy on coal and oil for New England. The question came up in the Senate in connection with a bill proposing to pay subsidies, and it was shown that because we had loaned or given to England a number of our oil tankers it was impossible to ship oil to New England by tankers, but it had to be shipped by rail. Under that bill subsidies are being granted so that the people of New England can get cheaper oil.

I wish also to call attention to the fact—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I shall yield in a moment. I desire to call attention to the fact that the people of Montana who already pay a higher price for their gasoline and oil than the people of New England pay are going to have to pay the subsidy or a part of the subsidy which goes to the people of New England. The same thing is true of coal. I point that out as an illustration of how bad subsidies are and what a sinister influence they are on the people of this country as a whole.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator realizes, of course, that there have been times when there was no oil or coal at any price in New England.

Mr. WHEELER. I so understand.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator does not really mean that it is a sinister thing for the Government to give a little assistance to a section of the country whose productive facilities, leaving out of consideration for the moment human beings, are entirely necessary to the war effort. I cannot believe that the Senator really thinks that New England has received any special favoritism at the hands of the Government, for if he does think so, I am sure he will find that there is no one in New England who agrees with him.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate the fact that New England has been badly hit by reason of the shortage of coal and the shortage of oil, and, coming from New England myself, I sympathize very greatly with the people of New England. But I am pointing out the effect of subsidies generally. When subsidies are given on one article to one section of the country, then the rest of the people have to pay for the cheaper product the subsidized section is getting when they themselves derive no benefit from the subsidy at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think one of the cases where a subsidy is justified is on the ground that, because of war conditions, certain transportation costs have greatly increased. That situation affects the people in different sections of the country in different ways. For instance, a plant may be using coal in making war products in Pittsburgh with no increased cost for coal at all, whereas a plant in New England has a very large increase solely due to the war. I think the one exception I would make to the general prohibition against subsidies is a provision that the Government may equalize the cost of transportation where inequality arises because of war emergency conditions. I think in such a case it is not really a subsidy to the particular people involved, but rather an attempt to nullify the inequality caused by war conditions between different people.

Mr. WHEELER. I am perfectly willing to agree that, if there is any instance where a subsidy should be given, it is in the particular instance referred to by the Senator from Ohio. On the other hand, I point out that in my State, for instance, and in some of the other Northwestern States, oil is produced in those States, but notwithstanding the fact that we produce oil and cement and other articles, we have to pay on sugar, for instance, the San Francisco price plus freight to Billings, Mont., right where the sugar factory is located, where the beets are grown. Likewise we pay on oil, which is taken out of the ground in Montana, the Oklahoma price plus the freight to Montana. The same thing is true of various other articles produced in that State. Those States are not only being discriminated against at this time but they are discriminated against at all times. That is why, let me say to Senators from New England, the people of my State are asking, Why should a subsidy be given to New England? Why should

a subsidy be given to this section or that section when we are already paying a higher price than they are paying and when of necessity we will have to help pay the taxes in order to provide the subsidies? That is an illustration of the effect of subsidies generally upon various groups of people and upon various sections of the country.

I say that, in principle, a subsidy by the Government of the United States is wrong and is bound, in my judgment, to have a kick-back, as the editorial in the Chicago Daily News points out. Under any theory of government, the principle of subsidies, in my judgment, cannot be defended.

I condemn the action of the R. F. C. in providing funds for subsidies, and of the administration when in order to pay subsidies, money is taken out of the R. F. C. and out of the Treasury of the United States. It amounts to the same thing, for taking it out of the R. F. C. means taking money, the taxpayers' money, out of the Treasury of the United States, without any appropriation by the Congress of the United States and without any law.

As I pointed out, some people say that England is paying subsidies. After all, if England is doing something, that is no reason why the United States should do it. I have heard it repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that we ought to do a certain thing because it is what England is doing; we even hear it stated, "This is what Germany is doing, and, consequently, we have got to do the same thing." We are taking a leaf out of the book of Mr. Hitler and out of other books, and saying that the people of the United States have to take certain action because some other country has taken it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I have noted statements that different committees are against subsidies, and I take it from the sentiments expressed here that the Senate is against them. Then, why is there not presented a bill to notify the administration and our people that, so far as the general principle of subsidy is concerned, we will legislate against it? The question has arisen before different committees. The question of the butter and meat subsidy is before my committee. The testimony which was given against a subsidy on those products was amazing. Here we are talking about subsidies; committees are investigating the subject but nothing is done, and in the meantime subsidies are in operation. Why not stop it now?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill now pending before the Senate and on the calendar which, if enacted, would prevent the use of money by the R. F. C., and, as I understood him a few moments ago, the Senator from Ohio said that if no other Senator does so, he intends to offer an amendment to that bill prohibiting all subsidies of every kind and character.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that, so far as I know, there has been no application to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for the money with which to pay a subsidy, but a few days ago, as the Senator from Virginia has just explained, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, whom we all know and whom we all like and admire, came before the Byrd committee and told us very frankly that \$450,000,000 had been set aside to pay subsidies on beef and butter, as I recall, or meat and butter. We asked him to whom he was going to pay the subsidy, whether he was going to pay it to the producers. He was rather vague, as I recall. I have sent for the testimony so as to put his exact words in the RECORD, in order that there may not be any mistake about it, since I would not want to do him an injustice. The answer in substance was, however, that they were going to pay the subsidy to the meat packers.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I asked him what about the producers. He said the producers would get the benefit of it, as I recall the testimony, by the stabilization of prices. In other words, that through the \$450,000,000 which the Government would turn over to the packers, in some way, somehow, by some method I could not understand—if it can be done in the way explained I am unable to understand it—the producers would indirectly get the benefit by not having to take a lower price for their products. To my mind the payment of \$450,000,000 to the packers of the country, as indicated in the statement given us by Mr. Jones, will be merely a kindly, agreeable, costly gift by the Government to the packers.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. When the question of the roll-back was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a point was brought out by the Senator from Oregon to which I should like to call attention. A question was asked as to how much wages had increased in the last 2 years, as I recall the question. The answer was that they had increased 100 percent. Then the question was, "How much have farm prices increased?" The answer was "22 percent." Mr. Jones was asked, "Do you not think that with this tremendous advance in wages a pay-as-you-go plan might be inaugurated, and that those who are getting this tremendous increase in wages should pay the 46 cents which the Department of Agriculture has fixed, rather than reduce the price to 41 cents, and pay the processor?" We said, "Which do you think would be better, to have the one who receives increased wages pay that out of his 100 percent increase, and leave the producers of milk and cream to get 46 percent?" Mr. Jones' answer was, "You have me cornered."

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; of course he could not say anything else but that he was cornered. I can understand that there may be a few articles which here-

tofore have not been produced in this country and which our people have been denied because of the war, and which it is necessary to produce here, and that it might be necessary to give subsidies in order to encourage the planting of some new crop which the farmers have not heretofore produced, and perhaps they do not know whether they can produce them at the price fixed.

Mr. SMITH. And the Government pay for the experiment.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; in other words, let the Government pay for that particular experiment. But to give a subsidy on butter, to give a subsidy on meat products, to give subsidies on this and on that, in my judgment, is absolutely wrong and should not be permitted by this Government.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress will do something about this matter and that the Congress will pass a law prohibiting the money of the R. F. C. being used for the purpose of paying subsidies unless request is made of Congress and a law is passed by the Congress permitting that sort of thing to be done.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. When Mr. Jones testified before the Joint Economy Committee it appeared that, in addition to the \$450,000,000 for subsidy payments on meat and butter, he was already paying the following subsidies annually:

Petroleum and petroleum products.....	\$225,000,000
Sugar.....	17,805,000
Coal.....	25,000,000
Chilean nitrate.....	3,250,000
Fiber.....	1,100,000
Petroleum coke.....	250,000
Aluminum rods and bars.....	250,000

In addition to that he has agreed to pay excess production costs on copper and some other commodities of which he did not have an estimate of the cost. So we have already embarked upon the subsidy policy. He has agreed to pay premiums for the domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc in excess of the 1941 production, at an estimated cost of \$30,000,000 each year.

Mr. WHEELER. I find a widespread opinion that because the subsidy is being paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or is being paid by the R. F. C., the people are getting the benefit of it but will not have to pay for it. They think it is possible to take it out of the so-called rich men of the country. They do not realize that, after all, the taxes have to come out of all classes of people, either directly or indirectly, and that if we took all the money of all the so-called ultrarich, there would not be enough money to pay the interest upon our bonded indebtedness at the present time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now have Mr. Jones' testimony before me, and I read from page 1135:

The CHAIRMAN. What I mean is this \$450,000,000, how are you going to get it back to

Tom Jones who sells the hogs over 3 or 4 months, how does he get his part of it?

Secretary JONES. He will get his part of it, because the packer will continue to pay the prevailing prices.

The CHAIRMAN. It all goes to the packer then?

Secretary JONES. No; it does not go to the packer.

Senator McKELLAR. Who ultimately receives it?

Secretary JONES. It reaches the animal man.

I judge he means the man who produces the animal.

Senator McKELLAR. Who actually receives the money?

Secretary JONES. The packer, the producer.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the packer gets it. He does not give it back to the producer of the animal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me finish the quotation:

Senator McKELLAR. The packer actually receives it?

Secretary JONES. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. It depends on whether or not anybody else gets it.

Secretary JONES. I would not think so.

There he admits that the producer of the meat gets no part of the money, but that the packer gets the money, and that in some way, by the stabilization of prices, keeping prices where they are now, the producer will get the benefit. There is a ceiling on the price.

Mr. WHEELER. What I assume he means is that the packers were saying that they were being squeezed because they could not afford to pay the prices which had been fixed by the O. P. A. to the stock growers, and then process the product at the price at which they were required to sell it.

So in order to stabilize the price, in order to give the consumer a cheaper price, the packer was given a subsidy. I do not know whether the packer is today receiving a sufficiently high price for his product, but let us assume that he is not receiving the price he ought to receive. Some persons in the United States eat more meat than do others. Some persons do not eat any meat. Some persons require more meat than others. The payment of the subsidy means that the person who does not eat any meat and the person who eats very little meat will be asked to pay taxes in order that the person who eats more meat can have cheap meat. The same thing applies all the way down the line. Some families possibly cannot buy butter because they cannot afford to pay the price for it, and therefore must use oleomargarine. If some families must use oleomargarine because they cannot afford to buy butter, they either directly or indirectly are obliged to pay taxes in order that others may be enabled to buy butter at a lower price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] a moment ago stated that lead, copper, and zinc receive subsidies. Of course they are in a different category altogether from but-

ter, cream, and beef, for the reason that the Government is the only purchaser of zinc, lead, and copper, and these metals are being used altogether in the war effort. The subsidies which are being paid for the production of these metals go only to new producers. Old producers of copper, lead, and zinc, who were operating prior to the war, receive no subsidies whatever for what they produce. The subsidy, or incentive payment, is given only to the new producers.

Mr. BYRD. That was not the testimony which Mr. Jones gave, although I agree with the Senator from Colorado that the metals present an entirely different question. Mr. Jones testified that premiums are paid for domestic production which is in excess of the 1941 production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I asked Mr. Jones the specific question if it would not apply to the Anaconda Copper Co., and he said it would.

Mr. WHEELER. I think Secretary Jones is wrong in that respect. The subsidy would apply to that company only as it developed some new property.

Mr. BYRD. No; the Secretary said that for production which was in excess of 1941 production the company would receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that statement is wrong for the reason that the Anaconda Copper Co. is not producing as much now as it did in 1941.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Montana spoke of new producers. If the Anaconda Copper Co. were to produce more now than it produced in 1941 it would be eligible to receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. It would not necessarily have to be a new producer. An old producer who increased his production over that of 1941 would receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certain regulations are drawn around that provision, however.

Mr. BYRD. I am not objecting to that particular form of subsidy. I am simply calling attention to what the Secretary said.

Mr. WHEELER. The Government has fixed the price of copper at 14 cents. During the last war the price of copper was 27 cents. Perhaps the price of copper was too high at that time. At this time an increase in price of copper has been sought by producers. Rather than grant a general increase in the price of copper a subsidy has been provided to be paid only for copper produced in mines or portions of mines which were not previously producing to any great extent. With respect to the production of main mines I am quite sure that under the present rules and regulations the producers receive no subsidies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more so the RECORD may be made absolutely correct?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find an additional statement in the hearings with reference to the \$450,000,000:

The CHAIRMAN. All the farmer gets is the fact that his price is not reduced.

Secretary JONES. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. He gets the same price that he now gets?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read:

Secretary JONES. That is correct.

Senator McKELLAR. The subsidy goes to the packer, the processor, and the distributor.

The Secretary did not answer my last statement, but it was made in connection with the general discussion. I call attention to that testimony in order to show that so far as this enormous subsidy of \$450,000,000 is concerned every dime of it, every cent of it, goes to the packer or to the distributor. Not a single cent of it goes to the farmer who produces the meat or the butter.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that the \$450,000,000 represents simply the beginning of the subsidy program.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, of course; it is simply the beginning of it. Anyone who knows anything about subsidies must be aware that if we begin giving subsidies to one group or to another group, every other group in the country will come to Washington clamoring for subsidies and saying, "We cannot continue to produce and to meet the war requirements without receiving a subsidy."

As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has pointed out, the Government purchases or takes all the copper which is produced in this country. The Government could have accomplished the same purpose without giving subsidies simply by saying, "We will give you 16 cents or 17 cents for the copper you produce over what you produced last year."

Subsidies are wrong in principle, whether paid to copper companies, or to packers, or to manufacturers, or to any other group in the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Especially is it wrong to take the subsidy money out of the funds of the R. F. C., which is a banking institution and which was not created by Congress for the purpose of making appropriations which are nonrecoverable. The R. F. C. is a banking institution supposed to make loans which will later be repaid, or at least such part of them as it is possible to recover. In this instance the R. F. C. is being used as a means to bypass Congress, so Congress will not have anything to say about the matter at all. Thus the funds which Congress authorized for banking purposes are being given away and will never be recovered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, we see day by day attempts being made by various bureaus and departments to bypass Congress in every possible way, shape, and form. Yet those who cry the loudest about preserving democracy and parliamentary government in this country constantly shout that it is necessary for these bureaus and departments to bypass Congress because they cannot get everything they want from Congress through the ordinary methods which are established and under the ordinary principles of a democratic republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is also true, is it not, that anyone who accepts

subsidies from the Federal Treasury accepts at the same time regulation by the different bureaus?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. I repeat what I said at the beginning, that I think subsidies are wrong in principle. I wish to compliment the publisher of the newspaper in which the editorial previously mentioned was published and the Secretary of the Navy for permitting the publication of the editorial, if he did permit it, and I wish to say that I sincerely hope I shall be afforded an opportunity to vote on legislation which will forbid the R. F. C., or any other agency of Government, from granting subsidies unless the subsidies are first approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 89, beginning in line 4.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

And to insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, in-

cluding (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, \$29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C., 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under the caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under

the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said Act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said Act \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, under rule XVI, I make the point of order against the committee amendment now under consideration, beginning in line 4 on page 89.

Paragraph 2 of rule XVI provides that:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legis-

lation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Paragraph 4 of the same rule provides that:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the provisions included under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," were not in the bill as it came over from the House of Representatives, and there has never been any authority in law for this appropriation. This program was started by Executive order in the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in 1934. On April 30, 1935, the President issued an Executive order creating the Resettlement Administration, which took over that part of the F. E. R. A. program, as well as certain activities of other agencies. On September 1, 1937, the Secretary of Agriculture issued a memorandum creating the Farm Security Administration as successor to the Resettlement Administration, which had been transferred to the Department of Agriculture by Executive order of the President on December 31, 1936.

The Congress has never enacted legislation creating the Farm Security Administration, and has never authorized by law the program known as Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate to the language on page 90, beginning in line 5 "without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

That is certainly legislation, because it sets aside existing law.

In line 9 we find the language:

Provided, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

The rules have repeatedly been interpreted to mean that any additional duty or responsibility placed upon any agency of the Government, especially when such agency was not authorized by law, is regarded as legislation.

The language of the amendment beginning on line 18 on page 90, and continuing to and including line 5 on page 91, can certainly be regarded as legislation.

I also invite attention to the language beginning in line 6 on page 91, as follows:

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural-rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is a change in existing law.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, that is a change in the existing law, and is in the same cat-

egory as the legislative amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia with respect to the loans of \$30,000,000 to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the Rural Electrification Act.

Mr. President, it seems very obvious to me that, with the exception of perhaps that part of the amendment on page 92 beginning with line 5 and ending in line 13, which represents restriction, the remainder of the amendment offered by the committee down to and certainly including the first paragraph on page 93 is general legislation upon a general appropriation bill.

In accordance with the rules of the Senate, **Mr. President,** I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. **Mr. President,** I believe that clearly under the precedents of the Senate the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia in this instance is not well taken and should be overruled. The Senator has stated there is no statutory authority for these rehabilitation loans. I respectfully invite his attention to title II of an act of Congress approved July 22, 1937. It reads as follows:

TITLE II—REHABILITATION LOANS

BORROWERS AND TERMS

SEC. 21 (a). Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property), and for the refinancing of indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

That is the statutory authority delegated by an act of Congress, which has never been repealed, to the Secretary to make loans for rural rehabilitation.

I ask Senators to refer to line 19 on page 89 beginning with the words "farm debt adjustment service." There is statutory authority found in this act for the carrying out of that service, and I read from section 22 of the same act from which I have already read, which was approved, as I have said, on July 22, 1937:

The Secretary shall have power to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors and may cooperate with and pay the whole or part of the expenses of State, Territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such debt adjustment. He is also authorized to continue and carry out undertakings with respect to farm-debt adjustment uncompleted at the time when appropriations for the purpose of this section are first available. Services furnished by the Secretary under this section shall be without charge to the debtor or creditor.

I further invite the attention of the Senate to title I of the same act which provides as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make loans in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico to persons eligible to receive the benefits of this title to enable such persons to acquire farms.

(b) Only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to receive the benefits of this title.

Then follow a great many details with regard to the making of loans to farm tenants, to farm laborers, and to sharecroppers to enable them to purchase farms.

So, Mr. President, so far as concerns the charge which has been made that the Congress has never approved rural rehabilitation loans, I thought it was well for me to read these items in the act—this still live statute—to show that Congress has had ample authority in times past for a comprehensive program of rural rehabilitation. The appropriations which have been made from year to year for the purpose of making these loans have been made to the Secretary of Agriculture and not to the Farm Security Administration. The Farm Security Administration is the agency which has been utilized by the Secretary. But so far as the bill before us is concerned, the appropriation would be made to the Secretary of Agriculture just as has been the case in times past.

There are some portions of this amendment, Mr. President, which are legislative in character. The reference made by the Senator from Virginia to the provision authorizing borrowings from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not appear in the basic act to which I have referred. However, Mr. President, I do not depend, in opposing the point of order, solely upon statutory authority for the detailed program set forth for the making of rural-rehabilitation loans. This amendment was reported by the committee in the bill on the strength of one of the most elementary rules of both legislative bodies. It has always been recognized that where one body legislates upon a subject the other body has a right to amend it in any way it sees fit so long as the amendment is germane to the question which is referred to in the bill which comes before it. Every provision of the amendment is germane to a program of rural rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I submit that the House, by inserting by a floor amendment the language found on page 89 of the pending bill appropriating \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I, and by inserting the words—I will read from line 9—"and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act," legislated thereon. It makes no difference how slender the thread of legislation may be which comes to us from the other House. If there is any legislation there at all we are entitled to transform it into a steel cable, or a steel beam, so long as the amendment which we offer is germane to the general subject.

The provision in the House bill is undoubtedly legislation. I wish to submit to the Senate the language of section 6 of the act approved July 22, 1937. A comparison of this language with the House provision clearly demonstrates the fact that the latter is legislation:

Sec. 6. To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

I hope Senators, without regard to their views on the merits of this issue, will listen to the language which I shall now read:

Not more than 5 percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year.

I hope Senators will mark that language well—not more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year for carrying out this section for the purpose of making loans, shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. President, when the House struck out on the floor all the loan money and appropriated \$500,000 for the collection of outstanding loans, without making any authorization for loans, it made an appropriation of 100 percent of the sums which were available for loans, and there is no way of escaping the fact that that is legislation. It may be minor, but it has the effect of repealing section 6 of the basic act which was approved in 1937. So long as the House of Representatives legislates in any respect the Senate has a right to go fully into the whole question of rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase loans.

The point-made, Mr. President, at the outside, can only present the question as to whether or not the amendment is germane under paragraph 4 of rule XVI. I contend if the House of Representatives undertakes to repeal an act in a general appropriation bill, that the Senate may strike out the language repealing the act and provide for amending the act in the general appropriation bill. To rule otherwise would be absolutely to reverse every precedent the Senate has ever established in dealing with this question. It is undoubtedly in order for this committee amendment to come before the Senate and to be considered on its merits unless it is desired to repeal every precedent the Senate has established concerning the powers of one House to deal with an amendment of the other House which has the effect of changing existing law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the Senate amendment had been adopted by the House, all except the provision for \$97,500,000 to be loaned by the R. F. C., and the Senate committee had then attempted to insert that amendment in the House amendment, would not that be new and general legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think so. If there was any piece of legislation in the House provision we have a right to amend it in any words which are germane to the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the House feels that because of the authority of existing law these appropriations are justified, and the Senate comes along and passes an entirely new provision that is not authorized in existing law but brings a new element into the picture and ap-

propriates \$97,500,000, would not that be an amendment proposing new legislation? Why is it not the same thing if it is included in the amendment which the Senate committee proposes to the House amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio missed the point I was undertaking to make. I am making the point that the House did legislate on this question. If we go on the supposition that the House did not legislate on the subject, but that it merely conformed to the Rehabilitation Act of 1937, the amendment would have been subject to a point of order, but the House did not content itself with dealing with any provision of existing law; it undertook by this language to repeal and to nullify section 6 of the act to which I have referred, which provided that for administrative expenses the appropriations should never exceed 5 percent of the amount which was made available for loans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, paragraph 4 of rule XVI provides:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Why is not the provision about the R. F. C. general legislation and why is not the amendment itself subject to the rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because, Mr. President, the first clause of subdivision 4 of rule XVI relates to amendments which propose legislation de novo. It does not relate to amendments undertaking to amend legislative provisions which come to the Senate from the House of Representatives. The second clause of the paragraph provides—

Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received.

That is the only language in the entire rule which might be applied to the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that is very much more damning to the proposal, because the amendment is purely general legislation not proposed by the House. I cannot understand the basis or the contention of the Senator from Georgia that it is not general legislation. There is no statutory authority for us to tell the R. F. C. to get into the picture and loan \$97,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede that, but the Senator still misses the point. The first clause of the rule is only to be applied in the event there is no legislation in the bill before the Senate. If there is legislation in the bill before the Senate, the Senate has a right to proceed to change the legislative provision which comes before it from the other House, provided the changes proposed are germane.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is perfectly clear that in this bill there cannot be inserted in the committee amendment a new provision of law, even one relating to such a matter as including employees under the civil service, which is not in the House amendment and not authorized by any existing law and which no one ever

heard of until the Senate committee inserted it as an amendment. I cannot understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that the Senator from Ohio wishes very strongly to understand it. The fact is, nevertheless, that, without regard to the views of the Senator from Ohio, the established precedent of the Senate is that where the House itself has violated the rule against legislation on an appropriation bill the Senate has the right to legislate on the same subject in the Senate. The only rule that pertains to it is as to whether or not the Senate proposal is germane to the House amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is quoting precedents. Does he know of any single precedent in the whole history of the Senate where it has ever been held that because the House chooses to legislate on an appropriation bill with regard to one particular item the Senate, therefore, under its own rules, or the Appropriations Committee, has authority to legislate in any other way it might desire? In other words, assuming the Senator's own argument that the House has legislated with regard to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Senator's argument would lead anybody to believe that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee, under the rules of the Senate, has authority and power to legislate on anything with the subject of farm tenancy.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I never made any such contention.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But it is a logical result of the Senator's argument.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what the Senator from Missouri contends. The Senate committee has not undertaken to deal with any new question. The only questions we are dealing with are the ones that have always been contained in this bill, under the act referred to in the House bill, and which the House undertook to repeal when it inserted this provision in the bill. All of them have been carried on under the general act providing for rural rehabilitation loans, for tenant purchases, as well as for rural rehabilitation where purchase loans were not involved. There can be no question that this amendment is germane to the act in question. The rural rehabilitation loans are in the same bill that carries the tenant purchase loans which are referred to in the House provision which is before the Senate. If the House undertakes to legislate and does legislate in any degree upon any question, certainly the Senate has a right to legislate upon the same question. That is absolutely fundamental, and no other ruling has ever been made, Mr. President, in the period I have been in this body; and, I am not familiar with any precedent to the contrary.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator was reading from an act which was approved July 22, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. To create the Farmers' Home Corporation. I am reliably in-

formed that that corporation has never been created and is in a state of innocuous desuetude. Is the Senator assenting that because of this law, which has never become operative, this particular corporation has never been organized?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the question of the Senator from Virginia demonstrates unfamiliarity with this entire question.

Mr. BYRD. I would thank the Senator very much for an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that there is no mandatory provision here for the establishment of that corporation.

Mr. BYRD. I asked the Senator a question, and I am entitled to an answer from the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret if I seemed to be abrupt with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator was quite abrupt.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. I asked a very courteous question of the Senator. The Senator always tries to make these debates personal, which I do not think is proper. I have my right to my convictions, just as the Senator from Georgia has a right to his.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have absolutely no desire to infringe on any conviction the Senator may have.

Mr. BYRD. I certainly have a right to ask a question, which the Senator should not object to. The Senator was quoting from an act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, which, he contended, gave legislative authority for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, and supplies, and I ask this question, Has the Farmers' Home Corporation ever been organized?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not that I know of.

Mr. BYRD. It is a dormant corporation; is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is dormant, because the Secretary, under the specific terms of the law, was given two methods of procedure. One of them was that he could proceed under title I or title II to lend funds through any agency of his own choice, or he could proceed through the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. BYRD. He is not proceeding through the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that, and there is nothing in the act to require him to do it. It is absolutely optional. He may create the Farmers' Home Corporation. He never saw fit to do it, but that does not curtail his power to make loans under title I and title II.

Mr. BYRD. But this is what it says:

Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power—

And so forth. Section 23 applies to the Farmers' Home Corporation, which has never been organized. The act was passed, and was approved July 22, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will read section 23 he will see that it does not apply to the Farmers' Home Corporation. It says:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the balances of funds available to the Secretary—

Not to the Farmers' Home Corporation, but—

available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530—

And so forth. It has no reference to the Farmers' Home Corporation, and there is nothing in the act to make it mandatory on the Secretary to establish that corporation. It was an alternative. For some reason the Secretary saw fit to exercise the powers contained in titles I and II of the act, and he never saw fit to create the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the contention of the able Senator from Georgia, it is that the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations stems from the provision written by the House of Representatives, which appears on page 89, entitled "Farm Tenancy."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator states my position correctly.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the able Senator tell me what part of the amendment applies strictly to the farm-tenancy program, provided for in what is known as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my contention that when the House of Representatives proceeds to legislate with respect to one title of this act, the Senate has a right to legislate with respect to all titles of the Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not say that I disagree with the able Senator on that, but I was wondering whether it could be segregated and broken down to the point where we would know definitely which portion of the amendment specifically applied to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; or is the entire amendment a part of the Bankhead-Jones Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate provisions are offered to make appropriations for the Secretary with respect to general powers contained in titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I understand it thoroughly, but I think there is confusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. We go further than the Bankhead-Jones Act, I concede freely, but if the House has the right to deviate from the Bankhead-Jones Act in one respect, to legislate on the question of rehabilitation and tenant loans, we have a right to deviate so long as our deviation is germane.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator's contention is that once the House opens up the field, there is no limit as to how far the Senate may go, so long as it is dealing with loans for rehabilitation in connection with farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is exactly correct and the position is sound.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that if the House had legislated on the Bankhead-Jones Act without violating it in any way or attempting to impose any

additional legislative provisions, then the Senate, under the Senator's amendment, would be barred also from general legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator claims that because the House, dealing with the Bankhead-Jones Act, proposes one kind of general legislation—I do not admit it, except for the purpose of this question—therefore the Senate may impose an entirely different kind of general legislation, in spite of the Senate rule that no general legislation may be proposed to an appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; so long as it is germane, and I contend that paragraph 4 of rule XVI relates only to new legislation and not to changing legislation which comes before us from the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. But it seems to me clear that the amendment dealing with the R. F. C. is new legislation. It may have reference to a provision that is related to the Bankhead-Jones Act, but it is new legislation, and I cannot see how it can be said it does not come under the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to give my own position on that question. It is my construction that paragraph 4, which the Senator is discussing, relates only to new legislation which might be offered in the bill, but when the House has deviated from the rule which provides there shall be no legislation on an appropriation bill, undoubtedly, under all the precedents, if the House legislates in any respect, then the only qualification on the Senate provisions is that they must be germane to the general subject involved in the legislation, and this amendment is undoubtedly germane to the general purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which is referred to in the House legislative provision which appears on page 89 of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator one other question. I cannot see why the Senate provision is not one dealing in general legislation. There is merely a failure on the part of the House to appropriate for some of the purposes of the act; but that is not a violation of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language in the House provision which undertakes to liquidate the question by adding the words "and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made" shows that it is legislation, because section 6 of the basic act, which I have once read, says that no money shall be allowed for administrative expenses in excess of 5 percent of the amount that is allowed for loans. The House did not allow a dollar for loans, therefore, if they had appropriated \$5 for administration it would have had the effect of annulling section 6 of the basic act, which provides that the administrative expenses shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount made available for loans.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that can hardly be said to be a violation. Possibly the \$500,000 appropriation is void.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not void; it is legislation, because it is made in derogation of the express terms of the statute,

and contrary to the express terms of the statute. There can be no question about it being legislation. It might as well be provided in the appropriation bill that the Bankhead-Jones Act is repealed. Then would the Senator contend that we could not strike out that provision and offer an amendment which amended the Bankhead-Jones Act?

It is clear to me that, under the rule, the only question possible in this matter is whether the amendment is germane. Suppose the House tries to repeal some act in an appropriation bill and their action comes to the Senate. The Senate is not compelled to accept this House provision. The Senate has some rights. If the House went to the extent of saying in a general appropriation bill that an act approved on such and such a date "is hereby repealed," undoubtedly and unquestionably, in view of every precedent, the Senate could go into that matter, and amend the act which the House sought to repeal or reject the House amendment. Any other ruling would deny the Senate coordinate powers with the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement, because I think this is a very important question. I wish that Senators could disassociate the issue involved in the amendment and consider the matter from the standpoint of the parliamentary situation. I know it is always difficult to do that, but there was very sound ground, Mr. President, for the provision in the rule that an appropriation bill should not carry general legislation. It gave too great opportunity for abuse of the great power of lumping together legislation with appropriations, and making it impossible either to vote against or for the measure without involving the question of appropriations. So I want it generally understood that I am in deep sympathy with that provision of the rule.

But, as I see it, that is not the issue now at stake. The issue at stake is the question of whether or not the Senate shall maintain its unbroken precedents holding that it has the right to explore any field of general legislation which the House of Representatives may have entered. That, Mr. President, is a vital question; it is a question of great extreme importance as affecting the power of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it is not a question of the power of the Senate. It is the Senate's own rule which is being violated. It is a question of what the Senate wants. The Senate can set aside the rule if it wants to do so. The Senate can change the rule. It is not a question between the Senate and the House of Representatives; it is merely a question whether we shall abide by our own rules.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will bear with me, perhaps I cannot convince him, but, at least, I will have an opportunity to state why I think it is of great importance. If, for example, the Senate should take the position that the

House of Representatives, having legislated upon a subject, the Senate could not pursue that field and alter, amend, enlarge, change, or shrink the action of the House, it would bind itself to a legislative provision in an appropriation bill, which must pass in order that a particular department or agency may continue to function. The Senate would be helpless; it could not change, it could not alter the action taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senate can strike out the legislative provision which the House has inserted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That is entirely within its power.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it is within its power, Mr. President; but if the conferees on the part of the House maintain their position, the Senate is ultimately confronted with either yielding to the ipse dixit and the legislative action of the House without amendment, change, or alteration, or killing the appropriation bill. That is the whole theory behind this general rule. The purpose of the rule is to preserve the power of the Senate to act in any way the majority of the Senate sees fit, whenever the other body may have entered the field of legislation. It could not have been better put than it was put by Vice President Marshall when he said:

Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to the effect that general legislation may not be attached to an appropriation bill, still when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation, the House having opened the door, the Senate of the United States can walk in through the door and pursue the field.

Mr. President, I contend that it is absolutely necessary that we maintain that precedent. It is clearly a question here of the House having entered the field. The question which is raised in paragraph 4 of rule XVI is certainly one which could be given consideration, namely, whether the legislative action of the Senate committee is germane to the legislative action taken by the House of Representatives. I agree in that respect 100 percent with everything that has been said by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I think he has proven beyond peradventure of argument that the action of the Senate committee is germane.

But the question at issue is not as yet one of germaneness. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has raised the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation, and I appeal to the Senate, and I appeal to the Chair, not to sustain such a point of order, not to reverse the unbroken precedents of the Senate, but to maintain the legislative power of the Senate on a parity with the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Wisconsin has raised the question of relevancy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I did not raise it. I said that it could be raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to follow the invitation extended by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in one of his more courteous moments, and discuss this matter as a matter of parliamentary procedure rather than on the merits of the substantive proposition involved.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have listened to a very remarkable demonstration this afternoon. I have often heard it cited as the height of extreme statement that a man could take a match stem and run it into a lumber yard. But the Senator from Georgia has gone even beyond that in tenuous theory. The Senator from Georgia proposes to take a match stem and run it into a vast forest, into great sulphur mines, great factories, great railroad transportation systems, a lease-lend act, into great steamship facilities to transport the products of the match stem overseas.

Mr. President, the argument advanced by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Wisconsin, reduced to its simplest terms, simply means that if the House of Representatives in a general appropriation bill violates its own rule by the inclusion of any item of legislation, by that act it automatically suspends the rule of the Senate as to the inclusion of legislation in general appropriation bills, not only as to the item with which the House has dealt, but as to any other item which in its wisdom the Senate Committee on Appropriations may desire to tack onto it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to correct the Senator's statement that I made any such contention. I said that the amendment had to be germane.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am stating the effects of the argument made by the Senator from Georgia, as I understood it. I was not proposing to quote the Senator from Georgia verbatim. But the argument of the Senator from Georgia is that by reason of the fact that the House of Representatives in a provision beginning in line 5 and extending through line 14 on page 89, according to the contention of the Senator from Georgia, has changed the proportion set up by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, a specific act approved July 22, 1937, as to the proportion of administrative expenses, therefore the Committee on Appropriations is authorized under the Senate's own rules—and that is the only contention here as to the rules of the Senate; the contention is not made with respect to the right of the Senate as a whole to act, but as to the procedure under the rules of the Senate, that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee is authorized under the rules of the Senate to report an amendment dealing with any other legislation connected with agriculture or farm tenancy which the committee may see fit to report. That, as I see it, is the only issue before the Senate.

Mr. President, this is a specific act in connection with which the House is accused of having legislated. I do not desire to waste the time of the Senate in arguing whether the provision which

is stricken out in the House bill, to which I referred, is or is not legislation, because that is not necessary for the purpose of my argument. For the purpose of the argument I am perfectly willing to concede the proposition of the Senator from Georgia that the House has legislated by changing the requirement of the original act of July 22, 1937.

But, Mr. President, in the interest of orderly legislation, in the interest of preserving the rules of the Senate, in the interest of preventing appropriation committees constantly proposing substantive legislation on general appropriation bills, I deny the proposition that if the House has legislated with regard to the provisions of a specific bill, namely, the so-called Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has a right to go afield and take in any other subject which in its wisdom it deems desirable to take in in order to affect the question of farm tenancy or of agriculture in general. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the contention of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri is simply that, insofar as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is concerned, the Committee on Appropriations had the power and authority to explore any field in connection with that one piece of legislation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And that when the committee goes beyond that, regardless of whether the legislation it recommends affects the farmers, the legislation which the committee then proposes is subject to the point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator has admirably stated the position. In other words, a while ago the Senator from Wisconsin quoted a decision of a distinguished former Vice President in which he said, "the gate was left open and the Senate had a right to go through it." However, the Senate has no right, under its own rules, to do so. I desire to draw a proper distinction relative to the question of the right as between the two bodies. The Senate has a right to do anything it wants to do; but the Senate, under its own rules, as a matter of procedure cannot go through the gate the House has opened, and knock down both sides, and pour through as a general horde.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator's whole argument turn on the question of germaneness?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would seem to me that it does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The point of germaneness would apply, let me say, to the Senator from Michigan, to the question of whether a particular amendment would be germane to the provisions of

the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. No Senator has contended—at least, I have not heard any Senator do so—that there is anything in the amendment which is germane to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I contend that it is germane to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend, the Senator from Georgia, I must say that I suspect that, in claiming germaneness, the proponents of the committee amendment are endeavoring to escape from the provisions of the rule, and to submit the matter to a majority vote of the Senate on the question of germaneness, because the rule specifically provides for a majority vote on the question of germaneness. It seems to me there can be no question as to germaneness to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act when the committee takes up an entirely different act—in fact two different acts; they were cited by the Senator from Georgia himself—and goes beyond that, and changes that act or those acts by legislation, sets up new machinery under the R. F. C., and goes entirely outside the field of any administration of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which is the legislation claimed by the Senator from Georgia as his original authority for new legislation in the bill. I say there is no justification for going clear outside that act and setting up entirely new authorities—different acts—and setting up entirely new duties and different questions of personnel classification.

Mr. President, as I say, I intend to discuss at this time only the parliamentary situation, because I think a very important parliamentary question is involved. I think the whole practice of the Congress of restricting legislation on appropriation bills is involved in this question. If the practice—a practice more exemplified by this bill than by any other I have ever seen—of having the Appropriations Committee of the Senate absolutely substitute its judgment for that of the legislative committees involved is indulged in and carried out, then I think the other committees of the Senate and of the House might as well be abolished, because there is no use in having any other legislating done if the Committee on Appropriations, in a "must" bill, a bill which is very necessary to be signed, a general supply bill, is to come along and do the legislating.

Mr. President, of course, the reason for the rule which has always existed in the Senate and always existed in the House, at least for many years—certainly for all my lifetime—is very readily evident. Legislation comes before either body of the Congress for consideration upon its merits. It is open to serious discussion, at least in this body, and formerly was in the House; it is open to amendment; and it is open to any legislative action which the body concerned may see fit to take. It may be passed by one body, may fail of passage in the other body, or may pass both bodies and be vetoed by the President, without the sense of compulsion which applies in connection with general appropriation bills.

As to the great supply bills necessary to be passed in order to have the Government continue to operate, they have always been given a high state of precedence, as we say in the Senate, or privilege, as is said in the House; they have been protected against dilatory amendments and various other kinds of amendments, in order to expedite their passage. They are recognized as "must" bills in both the Senate and the House of Representatives; and only under the most extraordinary circumstances has a President of the United States vetoed a general supply bill.

Mr. President, it is for that reason, for that very justifiable reason, that both Houses have from time immemorial adopted rules against having their own Appropriations Committees, in the first instance, or individual Senators or Representatives, in the second instance, offer propositions for legislation on general appropriation bills.

As I said a while ago, this bill is the most remarkable bill I ever saw. I think there are 116 amendments to it. Approximately 100 of them have been subject to points of order. I am not certain as to the exact number; the Senator from Georgia can correct me if I am in error.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that the Senator has slightly exaggerated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly a great many of them have been subject to points of order; have they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that 5 or 6 out of the 116 have been. The Senator is slightly mistaken.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A great many of them have been subject to a point of order, and the Senator has recognized that fact by serving notice, under the rules of the Senate—as he has a perfect right to do—to suspend the rule.

However, Mr. President, as to this amendment, involving—as it does—open, flagrant legislation in every line of it—at least, until we reach the second paragraph on page 93, which is the fourth page of the amendment involving legislation—attempt has been made to railroad it through, on the theory that because the House has dealt with one bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee is relieved of its obligation under the rule, and can, as it sees fit, deal with any other measure in any way connected with the whole subject of agriculture.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a more important parliamentary question has been presented to the Senate during my membership in the Senate. I believe that if the Senate should adopt the view of the distinguished Senator from Georgia it might very well proceed to abolish all the standing committees of the Senate except the Committee on Appropriations, because the Committee on Appropriations would then be made the sole judge of what should be in an appropriation bill and what should not be in it. When that is done, the authority of the standing committees of the Senate is completely annihilated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the rule in this case is perfectly clear:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation.

In another place:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

It is admitted that this is general legislation. It is said that because of some precedents or rulings there should be incorporated into these provisions an exception which is not there. It is not in the rule. Not a word is said about it in the rule. The exception is said to be "unless the House, in dealing with the matter, has proposed some general legislation." There may be rulings to the effect that there should be such an exception in the rule, but it is not there. I do not see why we should not abide by the rules of the Senate as they are written. I cannot understand how we can write an exception into a perfectly clear rule of the Senate.

There is no doubt that this is general legislation; but it is claimed that the House has violated the law. I do not even admit that. I do not see how the House has violated the law. The House simply authorized \$500,000 for necessary expenses in carrying on this law, because there are some things to carry along. It appropriated no money for the general purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Therefore, it is said that it violated the section of the law which says that—

To carry out the provisions of sections 1001 to 1006 of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Not more than 5 percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out sections 1001 to 1006 of this title during such fiscal year.

That is section 6, title I, of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Frankly, I do not believe that the House violated the law. If the House did not choose to appropriate anything for loans under this act for this year, I see nothing in this provision that is intended to prevent the appropriation of the necessary funds for administrative expenses. In other words, the amendment did not purport to deal with any such situation. In order to prevent extravagance, the act provided that the general cost of administering loans should not exceed 5 percent of the figure authorized for any particular year. It was not the intention, if Congress should choose not to appropriate anything, to say that it should appropriate nothing for administrative expenses. Certainly, to hang on to that supposed violation of the House rule the power to suspend the entire Senate rule and step out into general legislation to authorize the R. F. C., under no legislative authority whatever, to advance \$97,500,000, or

twice as much as is authorized under the Bankhead-Jones law, is hanging a tremendous argument on a very small point.

I do not believe that the House violated the law. I do not think that that section of the Bankhead-Jones law would prohibit Congress, if it chose to stop loans, from appropriating a sum to administer the loans which have already been made.

So, Mr. President, it seems perfectly clear to me that under the express terms of the rule this is general legislation; it is admitted to be general legislation, and it should be ruled out of consideration by the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in support of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. It seems to me that sometimes a little common sense can solve most of these technical arguments.

I quite agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. The question here is whether or not the Senate will undertake to prevent itself from dealing with matters of legislation which have come to it from the House in an appropriation bill. However we may wish to obscure that question with technical argument, that is the fundamental question which remains. The only question here is whether or not, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, the Committee on Appropriations is bringing in new or general legislation. The common-sense view is to determine what was meant by the phrase "new or general legislation." It is my understanding that the precedents of this body, without exception, support the contention that the rule was designed to prevent the Appropriations Committee of the Senate from initiating new or general legislation. It was not intended, and has never been enforced, to prevent the Senate Committee on Appropriations from dealing with legislative matters which come to it from the House in an appropriation bill. That is the explanation of the decision so clearly laid down by Vice President Marshall, which was quoted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would not the Senate be in a very unique position if it were to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and discard all the precedents and rulings which have been made by the presiding officers interpreting the rules of the Senate, and start now to interpret them de novo, and in the strictest sense of the word, as he argues the rule must be interpreted? It seems to me that we must take into consideration the precedents and interpretations of the rule if we are not to discard a large body of procedure by which the Senate has been governed for many years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin.

The common-sense view of the situation is perfectly clear. The House of Representatives has dealt with this subject matter, which has been in the ap-

propriation act for 5 or 6 years, and which therefore cannot be regarded as new legislation. The proposed appropriation is supported by Budget estimates which have come to the House and to the Senate.

These provisions are now stricken out to a certain degree by the House in a legislative amendment. The House, acting within its rights, wrote this legislative amendment into the bill, in effect repealing a legislative enactment which has been on the statute books for 5 or 6 years. The Bankhead-Jones Act not only deals with tenant purchases, but also with loans and rehabilitation. So the House, having acted and sent the bill to the Senate, we must acknowledge that the House was acting within the scope of its rights.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not claim that the House could not refuse to appropriate any money simply because an act was in force; does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not. The House could have refused to appropriate, but it did not do so. The House dealt with a law which has been on the statute books for 5 or 6 years, and which dealt with a subject which has been handled in appropriation bills for 5 or 6 years, and undertook to modify the whole system.

As we all know, the purpose was to destroy the Farm Security Administration. I am ready to acknowledge that there are and have been features about the Farm Security Administration which have not had my support. The Appropriations Committee has attempted to deal with that question, and has provided for the termination of those activities; but the legislative judgment of the Senate and the House has been that the Bankhead-Jones Act ought to be maintained, and that loans for rehabilitation purposes should be made to small farmers. The House, acting within the scope of its legislative power, sent to the Senate this legislative amendment to the bill.

Those who desire to destroy the Farm Security Administration are urging the technicality of the Senate rule against new or general legislation upon an appropriation bill. I submit to the Senate that that rule was directed against the initiation of new legislation in the Senate committee. It was not intended and never has been interpreted as preventing the Senate from dealing with legislative matters which have been sent to this body by the House of Representatives in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have been necessarily absent from the Chamber for a time and have not heard all the debate. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Wyoming. Does the Senator from Wyoming take the position that the House of Representatives may repeal a law by refusing to appropriate money for performing the functions provided for in the law and that, as a result, the Senate does not have any right to disagree with the House?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In effect, that is the position that is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is certainly not the position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said it was, in effect.

Mr. TAFT. The House may pass a bill, and we may vote into it an appropriation of \$50,000,000 without the slightest question. There is no question about our right to disagree with the desire of the House to end the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I was merely trying to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota and stating my opinion. As I understood his question, he has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's understanding is very incorrect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was incorrect in that. There were two questions. The second question concerns relevancy, whether or not the changes which have been made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in the legislative amendment which came from the House are relevant. That is a question which must be passed upon by the Senate. But I do contend that the rule does not prohibit the amendment being submitted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator from Wyoming in a statement of his position. My reason for asking him to yield was that in answering the question of the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Wyoming apparently undertook to state the position of those of us who believe the point of order is well taken, and he stated it 1,000-percent erroneously, and I desire to challenge the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said, in response to the Senator from Minnesota that, in effect, what he stated was correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. On the question of relevancy I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming—relevant to what? What is the test of relevancy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The test is the subject matter—

Mr. GEORGE. Of what the House inserted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the whole legislative enactment of what the House put in and what it struck out.

Mr. GEORGE. It did not strike out anything, Mr. President. In plain language, it put in a provision which is said to be contrary to an existing provision of the original law. How are we to test the rule of relevancy? What has that to do with the civil service? What has that to do with the R. F. C.? What has that to do with enlarging the powers of the R. F. C.? I am worried about what is the standard of relevancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Georgia that, as I see it, the standard of relevancy is the act under which and for which this appropriation has been and is here being made. It has been made for 4 or 5 years, and there have been provisions in other appropriation bills authorizing the R. F. C. to advance money to be used for loans and rehabilitation under the Bankhead-Jones Act. My contention is—and I think it is the contention of the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, but I would rather have him speak for himself—that the amendment reported by his committee is altogether relevant to that general subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to add only one word further. The Senator from Missouri has stated this is something entirely new and we are trying to railroad it through the Senate. I merely wish to say that this program has been in effect for a number of years. The provisions relating to the borrowing of funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been enacted into law year after year for at least the last 4 years. I have not checked the dates; I think it has been for 5 years, but I know it has been for at least 4 years.

Mr. President, this provision was one of those which came to the floor of the House of Representatives without the benefit of a rule which is usually accorded the Appropriations Committee by the Committee on Rules. Due to the fact that the provision was legislation in the House, the entire matter went out on a point of order on the floor of the House. The chairman of the subcommittee who had charge of the bill in the House then offered the amendment which I contend amply supports any provision which the Senate sees fit to place in this bill which is relevant to the whole question of rehabilitation of farm tenancy in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question by the Chair?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia raise the question of relevancy?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I say the entire amendment is relevant.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Virginia has already made a point of order on the whole amendment on the ground that it involves new legislation in contravention of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI. The point of order I make is that the Senator from Georgia cannot supersede the point of order of the Senator from Virginia by a different point of order which has to do with the question of germaneness. The rule provides for a different treatment as between the point of order on the ground of new legislation, and the point of order on the ground of germaneness. My point of order is that the point of order involving the question of new legislation,

already having been made by the Senator from Virginia, it cannot be superseded and put aside by the Senator from Georgia raising the question of relevancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in understanding that the original point of order which was raised by the Senator from Virginia was based upon the interpretation of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI? My reason for asking the question is that paragraph 4 of rule XVI is the one which raises the question of relevancy. If the point of order of the Senator from Virginia was based upon paragraph 4 for the purpose of raising the question of relevancy, then the question has already been raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, the point of order of the Senator from Virginia refers to paragraph 4 of rule XVI and has to do with the first two lines, which read as follows:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Now, under that the amendment is certainly subject to a point of order.

Another ground is contained in paragraph 4—an entirely different ground—which relates to the question of germaneness. It reads as follows:

Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto, and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. President, that provision as to submission to the Senate does not apply to the first ground for the point of order under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, which was the ground relied upon by the Senator from Virginia in his point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on a parliamentary question I am always unhappy to be placed in a contrary position to that assumed by the Senator from Missouri, who is an able parliamentarian, but in this case I must disagree with him most heartily. There is no question that section 4 is complete. The question as to whether or not the amendment is general legislation, as I have insisted, applies only as to whether it is substantially new legislation; and the question of relevancy is one that addresses itself as to whether or not the proposal which is offered is relevant to the legislative proposition which it seeks to amend. I have insisted all the way through that it is entirely relevant because of the fact that the Bankhead-Jones Act, which was approved July 22, 1937, provides for the rehabilitation loans which are carried in this provision as well as for the tenant purchase loans which are carried in it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator say that he is relying upon the Bankhead-Jones bill which was approved in 1937?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not rely upon it. I say that we escape the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia that we are proposing new general legislation, because the House has already legislated on this subject, and having opened the door, even by one-half inch, the Senate has a right to march in as a body, if it sees fit, so long as the amendment approved by the Senate is relevant and germane to the House provision.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator relies upon the authorization of loans to provide rural rehabilitation under the act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation; but that corporation has never been created—it is a dormant corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The corporation was never created; but I have undertaken to point out—and I will read the entire act if Senators wish—that its creation was wholly discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. Title I provides for the farm-tenant purchase loans. Title II provides for the rehabilitation loans, just as is suggested in this amendment. Title IV provides for the Farmers' Home Corporation. I want to read from title IV to show that really the question of the Farmers' Home Corporation has nothing to do with this question:

(b) The Secretary shall have power to delegate to the corporation such powers and duties conferred upon him under title I or title II or both.

It says he shall have the power to do it, but there is nothing in the act which requires him to do it. As a matter of fact, he has never proceeded under the powers which were conferred upon him by the Congress in title I and title II. Mr. President, we have heard argument raised here not only as to the sanctity of the appropriation bill, which has carried this provision for some 4 or 5 years, but as to the time limitation that is involved. I wish to point out that not only has this provision been in the bill for years but it was submitted in the Budget estimates to the Congress for the current year. This question has not been voted on up or down on the floor of either body of the Congress.

I say, Mr. President, not only is the question of relevancy involved but that we ought to face this issue squarely and determine whether or not this program, which has been in effect for some 6 or 8 years, shall be discontinued on a point of order which is raised by one Member of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand the Senator to say that the item was contained in the Budget estimates. The Senator does not mean to state to the Senate, does he, that the legislation contained in this amendment was also submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator mean to say that all these provisions were in the Budget estimates?

Mr. RUSSELL. They were submitted this year, and last year, and passed both bodies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where did the Budget Bureau get the authority in submitting items of appropriation to submit legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I should not like to be diverted to the question of the authority of the Budget Bureau. I was merely answering the Senator's argument that this was an entirely new proposition which we were trying to railroad through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator said the amendment in its present form was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am bound by what the Senator says because he has the information and I have not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not mean to say that it is in the identical form suggested by the Budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator admits it is legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was the legislation, as well as the estimate, submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language of the amendment which refers to the authority to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was contained in the language submitted by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As to the other legislative provisions, such as those requiring reports and as to personnel—

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And as to loans, and also the provision on page 90 down to line 5 on page 91, were they also submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language on page 90 from line 18 to line 12 on page 91 was submitted by the Budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that the Budget is now itself submitting legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that that language was inserted by the Budget because of the fact that the Congress had put that language in the bill for several years. The amendment may be legislation, but it is all relevant to the House provision. The Budget submitted language providing for the prosecution of the 195 rural rehabilitation projects which have, in one manner or another, come under the jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration. I do not wish to debate the details of those projects because they are not pertinent to this discussion, but I should like to say for the benefit of those who have condemned the Farm Security Administration because of rural rehabilitation projects that only 8 out of 195 were inaugurated by the Farm Security Administration. The remainder have been inherited either from the Resettlement Administration, which was directed one time by Mr. Tugwell, or from the several State corporations which were established for resettlement under the Work Projects Act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The effect, I understand, if the point of order were sustained, would not be to eliminate the Farm Security Administration but would be to send the bill back to the committee, and I presume the committee could eliminate all legislative matters and report it back with an appropriation of, say, \$50,000,000 tomorrow, even though the point of order is sustained. I do not think it is quite fair to say that this is a method simply to eliminate the F. S. A. It seems to me that it is rather a method of holding it within the original legislative authority of \$50,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator now is referring to the tenant purchase program and not to the rehabilitation program. There are some \$400,000,000 of loans outstanding on that program on which I think the Government has some claim and on which I believe it will make collections.

Mr. TAFT. I was intending to refer to the rural rehabilitation section, section 6, title I.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no earthly way that this bill can be reported back to the Senate with any provision for the liquidation of these projects which is not in some respects legislative, because it would be necessary to provide, if for nothing else, for collecting the loans made by the predecessor of the Farm Security Administration, which would be legislation. I insist it makes no difference about it being legislation, for if the House of Representatives puts just one thin string of legislation in the bill, omitting, as it does, section 6 of the act, the Senate has a right to legislate thereon, and the only question that can possibly be raised against the committee amendment is whether or not it is relevant and germane to the House amendment, and, as to that, I think there can be no doubt.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make clear exactly the point I made. I read paragraph 2 of rule XVI:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations.

I next read the first two lines of paragraph 4:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I desire to advert to the claim made by the Senator from Georgia that he relies for authorization for rural rehabilitation loans and grants upon the law which is entitled:

An act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to provide more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present

forms of farm tenancy, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Georgia did not inform the Senate that the Farmers' Home Corporation has never been organized; it is dormant; it has never been put into operation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I made no contention that we were relying upon the Farmers' Home Corporation. I said specifically on the floor that that organization was to be established, under the powers delegated, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. It has never been established, and the powers contained in the Farmers' Home Corporation Act have no connection with the powers contained in titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act. It is stated in the first paragraph of the act on which I am relying that—

This act may be cited as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I will make my point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. In response to a question from the Senator from Virginia, the Senator stated a few moments ago that he did rely upon this act for the authorization of the loans and grants for rural rehabilitation. In section 21 of the act it is provided:

Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property), and for the financing of indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

Let me call the attention of the Senator to section 23, which provides:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938—

Remember, this corporation has not even been organized, and is not operating—

the balances of funds available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order No. 7557 of February 19, 1937, which are expended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title.

Of course, there are no such funds available now. That was on June 30, 1937. Those balances have been used for other purposes. Then paragraph (b) provides:

The President is authorized to allot to the Secretary, out of appropriations made for relief or work relief for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1939, such sums as he determines to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

There will be no funds after July 1 that are going to be appropriated for relief or work relief.

Section 6 of the act provides:

To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

No part of that has been appropriated.

Mr. President, I think that during my membership in the Senate I have never known a more strained construction placed upon the rule relating to legislative provisions—for that is what it is in this appropriation bill—than to rely upon an act which creates a corporation which has not even been organized, which is still dormant, still inactive, and then to rely upon appropriations which are not available at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the opinion of the able Senator that if the point of order made by him were sustained it would knock out of this appropriation bill all funds for the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BYRD. No; the opinion of the Senator from Virginia is that the bill, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, would go back to the committee and be reported back to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senate Committee on Appropriations was not able to insert the provision in the appropriation bill when it had the bill before it, how would it be able to insert it on any other occasion?

Mr. BYRD. It could insert it if it did not provide for general legislation, and if it did, then the alternative is to present a motion for a suspension of the rules, as the Senator from Georgia has done in a number of other instances in connection with the same bill.

Mr. PEPPER. If the rule were to be suspended, would that require a two-thirds vote?

Mr. BYRD. It would; the requirement is the same as to all other legislative provisions. If the Senate rule means anything, it means that.

Mr. PEPPER. That would mean that an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration would require a vote of two-thirds of the Senate, whereas if the point of order should not be sustained then the item could be preserved in the bill by only a majority.

Mr. BYRD. It will do one of two things, it will either require the Senate rule to be carried out, namely, to return the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, or require a suspension of the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. PEPPER. In the opinion of the able Senator from Virginia, is it necessary that the provisions accompanying the item here in dispute must be contained in the bill in order to effectuate the continuation of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator should ask someone who favors the Farm Security Administration. I do not know. I know that in my judgment the provision does contain legislation. It is in defiance of the Senate rules, and should be treated as such. If the Senate wishes to suspend the rule, as the Senator from Georgia has asked in regard to a number of other legislative matters, which will be included in the bill, that is the privilege of the Senate. If the Senate

does not wish to suspend the rule, it should permit the bill to go back to the Committee on Appropriations, in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Has not the Senator already stated that if it went back to the Committee on Appropriations, the committee still could not insert the provision subject to the point of order?

Mr. BYRD. Of course, it could not insert legislative provisions, any more than it can now.

Mr. PEPPER. What the able Senator from Virginia means, then, is that this matter should go back to the Committee on Appropriations and should not come before the Senate under any circumstances except in such form as will require two-thirds of the Senate to pass it?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator approve of the Senate rule which prohibits—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator a question. He asked me several questions, and I should like to ask him one. Does the Senator approve the Senate rule which prohibits general legislation on appropriation bills?

Mr. PEPPER. As a general matter; yes.

Mr. BYRD. Why as a general matter? It has to apply to all matters or none.

Mr. PEPPER. The case now before the Senate I think certainly presents a close question, about which the Senate is entitled to exercise its discretion in passing on the point of order. I am very much persuaded by the reasonableness of the explanation made by the able junior Senator from Georgia that this is not new legislation since similar legislation has been on the statute books for 4 or 5 years.

If the Senator will permit me to ask him one last question, did I understand him to say that he opposed the Farm Security Administration being continued?

Mr. BYRD. I am in favor of transferring the operations of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration. There is no secret about it. I am the chairman of a committee that brought in such a recommendation a year ago. The Senator is well informed about that.

Mr. PEPPER. If I did not misunderstand, I thought I heard the Senator say a moment ago that that could be answered by someone who favored—

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me whether the Committee on Appropriations could bring back an amendment containing legislative provisions. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations, and I did not think it was proper for me to answer that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Was it the thought of the able Senator from Virginia that if the transfer of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration were made, the functions which previously had been exercised by the Farm Security Administration would continue to be exercised?

Mr. BYRD. That is my contention.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator did not expect to diminish any of the activities—

Mr. BYRD. I did not say they should not be diminished. I think the appropriations should be cut down, but I say that as to the permanent activities of the Farm Security Administration—and the debate on that will come later—they should be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when the Senate passes upon the point of order it is doing something far more extensive than passing on the rules of the Senate. What it is actually doing is depriving over 450,000 farm families, scattered all over the United States, practically of the means of subsistence above the level of impoverishment and squalor. As a matter of fact, the very condition under which the loans in question have been made to the Farm Security Administration tenants is that they cannot get funds from any other source. This is their alternative, their only hope. Take this privilege away from them, and they are left utterly destitute.

These loan provisions not only make it possible for workers to produce for the war, but involved in the item which is under attack here now by the able Senator from Virginia, who has been frank in his expression of not particularly favoring continuance of the Farm Security Administration, is opportunity for hospitalization, opportunity for some medical service, opportunity for some dental service, opportunity to obtain seed with which to plant their crops, opportunity to get a new cow if the only cow they possess dies, a new mule if the mule they have passes away, or the very food necessary for the nourishment of their families. All these would be taken away on a point of order by the remote Senate of the United States.

I say remote, Mr. President, because I doubt if we were to walk over the threshold of one of those dependent families and face the issue of depriving them of that succor which is all they have, or sustaining the principle of a point of order relative to parliamentary procedure, I doubt if many of us could make the decision in favor of the parliamentary technicality under the Senate rule against the lives and living conditions of those American families.

Mr. President, remember, if we had before us the statistics of the Selective Service, we would find that many a boy in the front lines comes from one of those homes, and if this point of order is sustained, it means that his mother and father and his brothers and sisters behind will be deprived of means and sustenance, because of a point of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that what the Senator from Florida says is correct. The Senator has no right to say that by the transfer of these activities to the Farm Credit Administration this great mass of citizens will be denied any relief or succor of any kind.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia, of course, knows that if this is legislation it is certainly legislation to undertake to transfer these functions to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Let us have such a provision in a legislative bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is much more violative of the Senate rules than the provision now under consideration, which is predicated on the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. BYRD. The provision can be placed in a legislative bill. I cannot permit to go uncontradicted the broad statement made by the Senator from Georgia. It is not correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It could not be done in this bill, I said. The Senator knows that if this provision is subject to a point of order, certainly if we were to attempt to transfer all these functions under titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a motion to suspend the rule and make this subject matter in order would certainly be in order before the Senate, and if the motion to suspend the rule to adopt the committee amendment were adopted, then any other germane amendment would be in order to that, and the whole question would be before the Senate, but that would be in accordance with the rules of the Senate instead of being in derogation of the rules.

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri would readily admit that a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be required in order to do that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly. That is what the rules of the Senate provide. The Senator from Florida always comes in and deplores something because it is prohibited by the rules of the Senate, or prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, or by the laws of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. No, I am not deploring something because it is prohibited by the rules of the Senate, or by the Constitution of the United States. I am deploring the poverty in the homes of Farm Security Administration tenants, and I am saying that the Senate does not have to take away from them their sole means of succor upon the parliamentary point which is presented here today, which is a mere technicality about which honest men may have a difference of opinion.

Mr. President, if this were an effort made flagrantly in the face of some direct provision of the rule of the Senate, or of the Constitution, that might present a different case. We lawyers always have heard it said that hard cases make bad law. But there are precedents which justify the item which the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has brought to the Senate today. There is certainly a reasonable difference of opinion as to whether or not this is new legislation. Everyone knows it is not new legislation to keep the Farm Security Administration in existence. It is simply a continuation of that agency, and its functions, which is proposed by this

amendment. That is the substance of it. After all, even a court of law is justified in looking behind the technicality, through the veil of technicality, and looking at the substance which is behind. If this were some irrelevant and extraneous matter which was brought here that would be different, but there is not an item, as I understand, that is involved in the point of order which is not a proposed continuation of what has been going on heretofore. The able Senator from Virginia was correct in saying that this matter should be handled by new legislation. Yet the able Senator from Virginia would not tell his colleagues that he proposes any such legislation now. I am not at all sure—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will be glad to propose legislation to make transfer to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. But would that not be legislation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me whether I was willing to propose such legislation, and I said I was.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator contemplate the introduction of any such legislation if the item in question is knocked out?

Mr. BYRD. I have not given consideration to that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator propose to destroy this item without introducing legislation to take care of the situation?

Mr. BYRD. Wait a moment. I will agree to introduce legislation tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. How long does the able Senator from Virginia think it will take to have such legislation adopted?

Mr. BYRD. The judgment of the Senator from Florida is as good as my judgment with respect to that matter. I think we can succeed in passing such legislation with the assistance of the able Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator proposes to diminish the Farm Security Administration as it now exists. It is not the present Farm Security Administration, with its present functions, that the Senator proposes to continue. It is something else.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, I do not propose to continue the present Farm Security Administration. If I did I would vote for this amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I think the Senator from Virginia has made clear that he is against the Farm Security Administration. Therefore he proposes to knock it out on a point of order.

Mr. BYRD. I resent that statement. I have a high regard for the rules of the Senate. I regard this proposal as being contrary to the rules of the Senate, and as a Senator I have a right to invoke the rules of the Senate without having my motives impugned.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think it is news to any Member of the Senate that the Senator from Virginia has not been generally favorable to the Farm Security Administration. I do not deny the Senator's right to feel the way he does.

Mr. BYRD. I have never denied that I am opposed to the waste and extrava-

gance in the Farm Security Administration, which is the greatest in any single bureau of the Government, and I will attempt to discuss that matter when the occasion to do so is presented. But when the Senator from Florida says I am prompted primarily by my opposition to the Farm Security Administration when, as a matter of fact, I am attempting to make certain that the rules of the Senate shall be sustained, he is incorrect in his statement.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to do the Senator from Virginia, for whom I have the highest respect, no disservice. I thought it was a matter of common knowledge that the able Senator from Virginia did not agree with many of us in our esteem for the Farm Security Administration. I believe in it, and want to continue it. If I had the power I would increase its appropriation instead of diminishing it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Florida would be willing to continue it even in defiance of the rules of the Senate, as I understand. That is the difference between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that if I have on the one hand the proposal to take away from nearly one-half million American farm families the opportunity they have to borrow a single dollar to buy a new mule, or a new cow, or the seed to go in the ground, or the money with which to harvest their crops, or the few dollars with which to pay a doctor or a dentist, or go to the hospital, or with which to buy food or to continue engaging in producing for the war itself, with a good record in producing food for the war—if that proposal were submitted on the one hand, and on the other I have before me a doubtful question of parliamentary technicality to decide, I should certainly resolve that doubt, Mr. President, in favor of the 450,000 farm families, and trust the Senate to preserve the integrity of its own parliamentary rules.

For I know, Mr. President, and every other Senator on the floor knows in his conscience, that if this item is knocked out of the bill today, if the point of order shall be sustained, it will mean that on the 1st of July the functions of the Farm Security Administration will terminate, and there will not be adopted by the Senate or the House any new legislation continuing those functions.

So, Mr. President, we are in substance voting on the square-cut, clear-cut issue of whether we are going to destroy, on the basis of a technicality, the Farm Security Administration, or whether we are going to resolve the doubt in favor of this item, which comes to the Senate not from a single Senator, but from one of the most distinguished committees of the Senate. We are voting on whether we are going to resolve the doubt against the technicality and in favor of the 450,000 needy farm families scattered all over America, with a creditable record of producing for the war and a finer record of sending their sons to fight in the war, or whether we are going to sit here as if we were automatons, as if we had no people's lives on our consciences and say, "Well, at all events, whatever be the con-

sequence, we have got to maintain the technicalities of the Senate rules against one of the Senate's own committees, and against a rational and reasonable difference of opinion between parliamentary experts on the legality of this item."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me preface my remarks by saying that I shall vote for the farm security proposal. I am in favor of it. However, I am wondering whether the statement made by the Senator from Florida is accurate—that if the proposal is voted down, that will be the end of the farm-security activities. I did not so understand the statement made the other day by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I felt that if this item should be voted down, the Senator would offer an amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, to be obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or appropriating the money directly from the Treasury. Am I correct or incorrect in that respect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I think it would be next to impossible to continue the Farm Security Administration without having some of the provisions of the amendment which are in the nature of legislation. There is no question that the provision for borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is legislation. There is no question that the Senate committee provision requiring the liquidation of the Rural Rehabilitation projects is legislation. My position is that if the House has legislated on these questions, as it unquestionably has done in this bill, the Senate has a right to legislate on them. I shall never admit that when a legislative matter comes from the other body on an appropriation bill, the Senate is tied hand and foot, and is limited to striking out the provision. Legislation coming to us, as a House of equal dignity with the other House, certainly gives us the right to take action similar to that taken by the other body.

Mr. President, I think sustaining the point of order would be very likely to relegate provision for continuing the functions of the Farm Security Administration to legislation; it would have to pursue all the courses of legislation; and, in effect, in view of the fact that the appropriation expires by the 1st of July, it would mean the death of the Farm Security Administration as such.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that the point I have in mind is whether the Senator would be able to submit to the appropriation bill an amendment providing the necessary money.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no trouble about the legislative sanction for the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. WHEELER. I see.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if the rehabilitation program is to be carried on as it is now carried on, legislation would be required in order to grant leave to borrow

from the R. F. C. or to exceed the appropriation which has been allowed.

The Senator from Virginia read the list of allocations which have been made under that act for the maintenance of that work. I freely concede that all the funds for that work have been expended, or practically so; a very small balance remains. But the Appropriations Committee, as I understand, has a right to exceed the authorization under the bill. I do not think that question is now involved.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will yield to me, let me say that a direct appropriation for that purpose, instead of a provision granting authority to borrow from the R. F. C., would not be legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator from Montana said there was no way around the difficulty, without enacting legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that, as a practical matter, with the time now remaining in which it will be possible to provide a direct appropriation for these purposes, and with the opposition which already has been evinced across the Capitol to these matters, it would be impossible to obtain such legislation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, what I am attempting to find out, and what is confusing to me, is whether we could not appropriate the amount of money required to carry on these necessary operations, without involving the question of legislation. I do not care whether the money is taken from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, provided the Congress directs that that be done or whether it is taken directly from the Treasury of the United States. Either one procedure or the other would have the same result. What I am wondering is whether, by increasing the appropriations and by writing in the bill an amendment to the appropriation items of the bill, we could not accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I think we undoubtedly would have a right to make direct appropriations for most of those functions. We could not liquidate the resettlement projects, nor could they be carried on, by provisions under the appropriation. We could not either maintain or liquidate them without having direct legislation. But so far as direct loans to the farmers are concerned, I think we could make them under the provisions of this act. We could not, except by legislation, take care of any grants to farmers who have been subjected to losses caused by the ravages of floods in recent months; because an authorization to do that would be in excess of the powers contained in title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank both Senators for what they have said. I shall conclude what I have to say. I am not an expert on these matters, but I have been in the homes of farmers receiving such aid, and I know what will happen if the aid is cut off. I know that the consensus is that sustaining the point of order would jeopardize, if it would

not absolutely assure cutting off, the services rendered farmers by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, from time to time the Senate has voted on the question of sustaining points of order. If the question is a close one, sometimes the Senate has gone on one side of the line, and sometimes on the other side of the line. There is no flat or fixed rule on the subject. Certainly the House of Representatives has opened the doors to this irregularity, if it is one, by legislating on the subject first. The Senate Appropriations Committee did not inaugurate the delinquency, if it is one. Our committee is simply building on what the House did. I believe there are in this body a sufficient number of able Senators to protect the integrity of our rules. I simply submit that in a case of this sort, one which means so much to so many people, if there is any possible doubt about the decision we should make, it is better to bend a little on the side of humanity and the preservation of lives and the standard of living, meager as it is, of these 450,000 families, than to sit back as if we lived in a vacuum, and wash our hands, like Pilate, of the decision, and say, "I shall have nothing to do with this matter because to give these people help offends my sense of discretion and judgment about what should be done on this technical point under the parliamentary rules of the Senate."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia for a moment so that I may obtain his thought on this matter.

Under title II—Rehabilitation Loans, subtitle "Borrowers and Terms," subsection 21 (a) reads as follows:

Out of the funds made available under section 23 the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs—

And so forth.

I repeat the first words:

Out of the funds made available under section 23.

Now, turning to section 23, the title of which is "Appropriation," we find that subsection (a) reads as follows:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the balances of funds available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order Numbered 7557 of February 19, 1937—

Mark this well, Mr. President—

which are unexpended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title.

Having quoted those two provisions, let me say that of course the Senator knows, as do all other Members of the Senate, that the funds which were unexpended as of June 30, 1937, have been exhausted. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure that all of them have been exhausted. They are practically exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Prior to the creation of the Resettlement Administration un-

der W. P. A., State corporate organizations for rural resettlement and rehabilitation were set up. Some of those funds are still available in the States, but the amount is very small.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been advised that the funds have been expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are practically exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. They are the funds which were authorized to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If those are the funds which were authorized to carry out the provisions of the act, and were the funds which were unexpended on June 30, 1937, they are the only funds authorized, because, turning back to rehabilitation loans, the first line reads:

Out of funds made available under section 23—

I have just read section 23. Therefore it seems to me to follow, regardless of the merits of the Farm Security Administration's program, whether we are for it or against it, the language and the import of the language are definitely clear. The only funds authorized by act of Congress to carry out the provisions of this act were those which were unexpended as of June 30, 1937.

I am arguing this question in good faith. I am not trying to take any technical advantage of the law; but I am trying to find out what the law is. Before the Senator comments, I wish to commend him for his candor in answering the inquiries of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Virginia. In my judgment he was completely honest in his answer to those inquiries and did not reserve anything which might have been in his favor when he said that legislation was necessary to do some of the things he enumerated.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator is candid, because we can arrive at a decision when men are candid.

Mr. RUSSELL. I always try to be candid in dealing with the Senate not only in connection with this bill but in all other matters. I have not reserved anything, and have no intention of doing so. In the first place, I have no motive for doing so, because I think we can legislate as far as we want to go under the rules.

Mr. TYDINGS. I rose to ask the Senator only this question: As I understand, the Senator does not take issue with what I have presented, but he does say that inasmuch as the House has legislated he feels at liberty to carry out that legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if the House had not legislated, a point of order would lie because, unless the rule were waived, there would be no reason why the Senate Appropriations Committee should put in the bill the provision referred to. The Senator feels that, the House having adopted a provision relating to the subject, the Senate has a right to proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are some legislative provisions in this amendment. I made that statement in the very first

moments of my remarks when I presented my views on the point of order. There are undoubtedly some legislative provisions. The provision which requires the liquidation of farm security projects is legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to direct my attention to this one provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not impressed with the argument of the Senator from Maryland that because of the limitations in section 23 we cannot make appropriations. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the rule that the Committee on Appropriations may recommend appropriations in excess of the authorization, so long as the purposes of the appropriation are defined by legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; but let me ask the Senator what is the authorization, if we strike down section 21, entitled "Rehabilitation Loans"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is stricken down—not by the point which the Senator raises.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I am raising, to make it specific, is that when we see what that authorization is we find these words:

Out of the funds made available under section 23.

Therefore no other funds were made available, and the committee had no right to legislate funds into the bill unless they were in accordance with the authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that to be the determining factor as a limitation on the committee. If, instead, the language read, "Not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be appropriated to the Secretary for these purposes," under rule XVI the Senate committee would have a right to recommend an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for that purpose, so long as it was recommended for purposes which were authorized by law.

I do not think that that point is as pertinent as is the objection which has been raised to the legislative provisions of the amendment. But whether it is or not, I take the ground—and I have never been more convinced that I am right from a parliamentary standpoint—that if the House legislates on the subject, even to the slightest degree, the Senate has the right to canvass the whole field and take away from, add to, explain, expand, or contract that which the House has done in dealing with the matter, subject only to the rule as to whether it is relevant or germane to the action the House has taken.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I inquire whether all this debate is not out of order, unless the Chair wishes to be informed. I ask the Chair whether he needs any more information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule whenever the Senate is through undertaking to advise the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have not the slightest disposition to delay the Senate. However, in reading the law I could not

find any authorization for the committee action. The law provides that out of funds made available under section 23 these things may be done.

What is section 23? It provides that only moneys which are unexpended as of June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

I believe that if the question were submitted to the parliamentarian he would agree with the point which I have made. The Senator from Georgia does not let that point be the determining factor in arriving at his conclusion. The Senator from Georgia takes a new position, which he has a right to take, namely, that the House has legislated—

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not taken any new position. I have insisted on that position from the beginning.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not saying this in criticism. I believe that the point is material, because the law provides that no funds may be used which were not then expended as of June 30, 1937. The first provision of the law says that only out of funds made available under section 23 may these activities be carried on. Section 23 provides that no funds may be used for these purposes except the unexpended balances which existed on June 30, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate has a right to provide that such funds shall be borrowed from the R. F. C., it has a right to change that language.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know that I would agree to the statement that the Senate has that right, because borrowing is only another way of appropriating.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was predicating my statement on the assumption that the Senate has the right.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point remains that the authority for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs relates only to funds made available under section 23; and section 23 very clearly states that no money shall be used for such purposes except funds which were unexpended on June 30, 1937. Such funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the act.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that there is no legislative authority for the provisions written into the bill. As to whether or not the House, by writing in the legislative provision, has given the Senate the right to go ahead, I am not discussing that point at this time. I do not think it has; but aside from that point, there is no clear authority for the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask the very patient and distinguished Senator in charge of the bill another question on the subject of germaneness?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that the two sections of the Bankhead-Jones Act, one relating to rural rehabilitation and the other to tenant loans, are distinct measures, and that in this case the House, by its alleged violation of the tenant-purchase section, may have opened up the tenant-purchase end of the question; but I do not see how it could have opened up the rural rehabili-

tation loan question. In other words, I do not see that this is, in fact, germane to the matter which the House has opened up. Will the Senator give us his views on that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opening statement I suggested that that question might arise in the minds of some Members of the Senate. I stated that, in my opinion, so long as we dealt with the general subject of rural rehabilitation loans, we were clearly within the rights and powers of the Senate. That is a question which addresses itself to the discretion of each Senator. In my judgment, the entire committee amendment is absolutely germane to the purposes of rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy.

Mr. TAFT. Are not the two matters distinct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator regard the farm-tenancy program as separate from the rural rehabilitation-loan program?

Mr. RUSSELL. In connection with what I said in my opening remarks, I read both title I and title II as being the legislative background.

Mr. TAFT. But as I understand, the alleged violation of the House relates only to the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I freely grant that, but I am happy that the Senator admits that it is a violation, because if the House is guilty of a violation in regard to the tenant-purchase program, the whole question of rural rehabilitation is open to the Senate. There is no way on earth to escape that conclusion.

I invite the Senator's attention to the language which appears in the title of the House provision. What does it say? It says farm tenancy. So long as we are dealing with the question of farm tenancy, and rehabilitation, whether the persons be sharecroppers or laborers, the Senate is not only within its full rights, but also its duty.

Mr. TAFT. I believe very strongly in the farm tenant purchase end of the program, but it is the rural rehabilitation program which I think is doubtful. I think the two are distinct. It seems to me that if the House has opened up only one of them by violating the rule with respect to tenancy, that cannot be said to open up to general legislation the whole subject of rural rehabilitation loans, the law regarding which the House has not violated in any way.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the view of the Senator from Ohio. I entertain a contrary view. I think that when the House opens up this question, as it undoubtedly did, whether it was with respect to title I, title II, or any other part of the law pertaining to rural rehabilitation, the Senate has a right to legislate on that subject so long as the legislation is relevant to the whole question of rural rehabilitation. The Senator from Ohio has a perfect right to regard a part of it as being relevant and a part of it as not being relevant; but it is my firm conviction that if we reverse the precedents and say that we are not able at this hour to legislate, the Senate will surrender substantial rights, and the question will come back to plague and

hamper us. What is the danger in it? Let the Senate say whether or not it is relevant or not relevant, and what parts, if any, of these amendments should be adopted. If we place a limitation on our power by adopting the precedent suggested, in years to come the House will legislate and our hands will be tied by a limitation on our power which will enable us only to accept or reject a House legislative amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to paragraph 2 of rule XVI, which reads as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The present occupant of the chair will undertake to state the parliamentary situation as he understands it.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] raised the point of order basing his objection, as he has said, on paragraph 2 of rule XVI, and, as the Chair understood, also on the first two lines of paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have restated the point of order. I rely exclusively on paragraph 2 of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the understanding of the Chair that the Senator relied also on the first two lines of paragraph 4. The Chair now understands that the Senator from Virginia relies only on paragraph 2 of rule XVI.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has raised the question of the relevancy of the committee amendment, based upon a part of the language of paragraph 4. The Chair will read a part of paragraph 4:

And all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that when the question of relevancy was raised, not by the Senator from Georgia but by the then occupant of the chair, who is not now the occupant of the chair, I then made the point of order that the point of order of the Senator from Virginia, which had to do with new legislation, could not be superseded by a point of order having to do with relevancy under another clause of the rule.

I now call attention of the Chair to the fact that my point of order was the last point of order made, and therefore is the pending point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is mindful of what the Senator from Missouri has said, but feels that it is the duty of the Chair, under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, to submit the question to

the Senate. This question, under the rules of the Senate—which, by the way, are whatever a majority of the Senate determines at any particular time—is not debatable. The Chair therefore submits to the Senate this question: Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I renew my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is not debatable. The Chair has submitted the question to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to debate. I desire to renew my point of order. I make the point of order that the Chair, by his own action, is attempting to supersede the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia with another point of order. I make that point of order and ask for a ruling upon it from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Missouri is out of order. The Chair has submitted the question to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I insist on a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not make a mistake when he submits a question to the Senate for its decision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I insist on a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum. Under the Constitution the Chair cannot overrule that point, although the present occupant of the Chair is likely to overrule anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bore	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Eyrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The question pending before the Senate submitted by the Chair

is as to the germaneness of the committee amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. RUSSELL. And those who agree with the committee's action should vote "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding, if the yeas and nays are ordered, but the yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. I inquire, Who made the point of order with respect to germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it was made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Did the Senator from Georgia make it? The clerk tells me he did not make it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I urged throughout my entire remarks that the only question possible could be that of germaneness.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia did not make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia raised the question of relevancy.

Mr. BYRD. The clerk tells me that the Senator from Georgia did not make the point of order. This is the most remarkable procedure I have ever known.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Georgia did he raise the question of relevancy?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I contended throughout my entire argument that the amendment was relevant. That is my contention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia did raise the question. If he did not raise it, the Chair will not submit it.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Georgia did make the point, it should be a matter of record. I ask that the record be read to see whether he made it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment under consideration is relevant to the provision contained in the House bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order that the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia cannot be supplanted by a point of order that the amendment is relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit the question raised on the point of order by the Senator from Georgia, in view of the record that has been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have insisted that the only question to be submitted to the Senate was the question of relevancy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the chair all the

time, but the present occupant of the chair was informed that the Senator from Georgia had raised a point of order, and the Chair has a written memorandum on his desk to the effect that the Senator from Georgia had raised the question of relevancy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know what the Journal shows, but the Record tomorrow will show, and all Senators who are present must know, that I have insisted all along that this amendment was relevant to the House provision. That is the sole ground I took.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit to the Senate the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia if the yeas and nays are ordered. Is the Senate ready for a vote?

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the question be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia. The Chair will request that the point made by the Senator from Virginia be put in writing so that the clerk may read it to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggs
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdoch	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the point of relevancy was raised by me, and I am sure the Record and Journal of the Senate will so show.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am preparing the motion and will submit it in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say to the Senator from Virginia that the Senator from Georgia has now informed the Chair that the Record will show that he raised the point. If he raised the point, the Chair is of opinion that it ought to come in as it was originally presented, and, if he did not raise it, the Chair is of opinion that the point can be decided on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to let the Record be read, but every Senator

knows that my argument was that since the House has opened this question, the Senate amendment was relevant and germane.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the Journal be read to determine whether or not the Senator from Georgia made the motion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see how the Senator from Georgia could have made the point of order, because the point of order would have had to be that the amendment was not germane. He certainly did not make such a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. He could not make the point of order that it was germane, because that is the question the Senate is required to determine.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not understand that I was required to make a point of order. The only thing that was required of me was to make the contention that this amendment was germane to the House provision. That has been the basis of the argument I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the same question can be decided on the point made by the Senator from Virginia. So the Chair wishes to submit it on the point of order of the Senator from Virginia in order that the Senate may have a direct vote on the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I have the right to know what the Journal shows, and I should like to know. I have not myself talked with the Journal clerk, but he is a gentleman of very high class who has kept the Journal for a long time, and I should like to know what the Journal shows on this question. As I have said, I have not talked with the Journal clerk. I should like to know what the Journal shows.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit the point of order in writing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the point of order of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate, I should like to know what the Journal shows in regard to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As soon as the clerk reads, the Chair will hear the Senator from Georgia. The clerk will now read the point of order submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I make the point of order under Section 2, Rule XVI, that the pending amendment contains new legislation and is therefore, under the rules of the Senate, in violation of paragraph 2, rule XVI, which reads as follows:

"The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the Chair wishes to hear what the Journal shows with respect to the question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and I want to make a point of order against the point

of order, on the ground that it involves the relevancy of this entire matter. The whole matter of relevancy is involved, whether it is new legislation or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair hear what the Journal shows.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRD makes point of order that matter inserted by committee was, under Rule XVI of the Standing Rules, general legislation and not authorized by existing law, on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL made point of order that the House of Representatives having inserted legislation in the bill on the floor of the House by making an appropriation in excess of the amount allowed for administrative expenses under the basic act, to provide for the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, the committee amendment was germane and the Senate had the right to legislate on the subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I say that brings the whole question of relevancy before us, and I see no reason for deviating from the custom of the Senate. The rules have always provided that the question of relevancy in these matters should be submitted to the Senate, and I ask that the question of relevancy now be submitted by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion now that upon the question of the Senator from Virginia the Senator from Georgia expressly stated he did not raise the question of relevancy, and the question of relevancy is not raised on the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order against the point of order of the Senator from Virginia that it should be decided on the question of relevancy of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that it is too late to make the point now, and the Chair is now going to submit the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Chair asking the opinion of the Senate on the point of order under rule XVI, and will a majority vote prevail no matter which of these questions is submitted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Chair state, for the information of the Senate, the effect of the vote, that is, the effect of a vote "yea" and the effect of a vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the point of the Senator from Virginia shall be sustained, the bill will be re-committed to the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that; but should a Senator desire to sustain the point of order of the Senator from Virginia, will he vote "yea" or "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question the Chair will submit to the Senate now is, Shall the point of order be sustained? Those who vote "yea" will

vote to sustain the point of order, those who vote "nay" will vote against it.

Mr. HILL. To overrule the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay," and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay," and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is detained in an important committee meeting.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], who is detained on important public business is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who if present, would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bailey	Gillette	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Tobey
Buck	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	McFarland	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Moore	White
Eastland	Revercomb	Willis
Gerry	Smith	

NAYS—54

Alken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Austin	Heyden	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Overton
Bilbo	Holman	Pepper
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Burton	La Follette	Russell
Capper	Langer	Scruggs
Caraway	Lucas	Shipstead
Chandler	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Van Nuys
George	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	Wheeler
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Nye	Wilson

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Reed
Ball	Downey	Robertson
Barkley	Ferguson	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Glass	Truman
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Wagner
Brooks	Kilgore	
Butler	Radcliffe	

So the Senate refused to sustain Mr. Byrd's point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate on the question. I merely wish to remark that the vote just taken is a complete illustration and justification of the statement I have often heard made by a great man in years gone by, that the Senate had very few rules and did not pay the slightest attention to the few it had.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not generally indulge in debating a question when it is once settled, but in view of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I wish to state that an examination of the precedents of the Senate will show that the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, has sustained the universal precedents on the issue involved in this parliamentary question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if I may claim the floor again, since the Senator from Wisconsin brought the matter up, I undertake to say that the Senator cannot adduce one single precedent which is applicable to the present case, a case where the House has simply legislated with regard to one law—even if that should be legislation, which I deny, in this case—where it has been held that that action furnishes justification to the Senate, in derogation of the Senate rule, to legislate on an entirely

different question. That is the question presented here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have cited one case, and I could cite many others, and I pointed out that the Senator from Missouri in the discussion of this question has not cited a single precedent to support the position which he has taken.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I cited the Senate rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the committee amendment under consideration begins on page 89 and continues to the third line on page 95? Is that all one committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is correct. The committee amendment ends in line 3 on page 95.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division of the amendment. Perhaps the division should occur at the end of line 4 on page 93.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator place his suggestion in writing and send it to the desk?

Mr. TAFT. I would suggest that first we consider the part of the amendment striking out the language under the head of "Farm Tenancy", then the part under the head of "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", and then on page 93 the part of the amendment under the heading "Farm Tenancy". There is a clear distinction between those parts of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the language in question is all one amendment, but I think the Senator from Ohio unquestionably has a right to ask for a division of the amendment, and I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be divided, as requested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. RUSSELL. I reiterate that I consider it to be all one amendment, but I have no objection to dividing it. In order to bring the matter to a clear parliamentary understanding, I ask that the Senator consider first the item on page 89, after line 3, to strike out the language under the heading "Farm tenancy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None is heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is purely for the purpose of convenience. It is all one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first part of the committee amendment as it has been divided.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,

exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 89, beginning in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next portion of the amendment as it has been divided.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 89, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, \$29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as secur-

ity for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural-rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorization herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute for the committee amendment, the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, lines 16 to 24, and on page 90, lines 1 to 25, and on page 91, lines 1 to 25, and on page 92, lines 1 to 25, and on page 93, lines 1 to 4, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out the language therein appearing, and to insert the following:

LOANS AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and Production Credit Association, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption, "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere, through making and servicing of loans under this and prior law, \$12,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the States to provide such farm and home management assistance as may be necessary to borrowers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for these purposes shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional offices.

Loan fund: For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers, the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary of Agriculture upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$40,000,000. Such advances shall be made: (1) With interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary of Agriculture shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

MR. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as a whole as a substitute for the committee amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be considered as a whole as a substitute for the committee amendment.

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the acting majority leader if he will not be willing to let the amendment be printed—it will create considerable discussion—and allow its consideration to go over until tomorrow. Obviously, we cannot conclude discussion of it this evening, and probably some other section of the bill could be taken up and disposed of today. I should like the Members of the Senate to have the benefit of having the amendment before them in printed form, and of having it available tomorrow.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, I was interested in the amendment when it was read, but I could not follow it clearly. I should like to have its consideration go over until tomorrow, inasmuch as action on the bill cannot be concluded today.

MR. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, I would not undertake to oppose the wishes of the Senator from Oregon in this matter, because I know his views on the question. However, I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is practically the same as the House committee amendment, which went out on a point of order in the House. I think it is practically the same as the amendments proposed by the House committee, commonly known as the Farm

Bureau amendments, so far as the accomplishment of functions is concerned. I think most Members of the Senate have some familiarity with it.

Mr. McNARY. I could not tell from the reading; but I thought that probably its consideration could not be completed this afternoon; and probably we could take up some amendment not so controversial, and could consider the amendment of the Senator from Virginia tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that the two remaining amendments—one relating to rural rehabilitation and the other authorizing borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance the Rural Electrification Administration—are controversial, as will be any amendments offered to them. If the Senator from Oregon desires to have the bill go over until tomorrow, I shall not interpose objection, but I should like to point out that whatever remains will be controversial. We shall not relieve ourselves of any controversy.

Mr. McNARY. I am satisfied that we can complete action on the bill tomorrow. It is now almost 5 o'clock, and many Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity to be in their offices today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not resist the request. I have no objection to having the Senate take a recess at this time.

REPORT FROM THE ALEUTIANS—INVITATION TO WITNESS MOTION PICTURE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Signal Corps has just completed a motion picture entitled "Report From the Aleutians." It is in technicolor, and runs for 42 minutes.

On the surface, Report from the Aleutians is the intimate, factual story of our men and their fight to establish attack bases along the finger of islands pointing to the heart of our enemy, Japan.

Actually, it is the story of how all services and arms of the American fighting forces—air, sea, and land—have teamed up for victory.

As we well remember, in June of 1942 the Japanese, aiming at our continent, struck at Dutch Harbor and Midway. Reeling back from that attack, the remnants of the foe sought refuge at Kiska and Attu, in the Aleutian chain. Immediately it became necessary for us to establish ourselves within striking distance of that new danger.

The motion picture is the record of how we succeeded, how our fighting forces converted a spongy, barren, storm-ridden island into an attack base, how they built an airfield out of a lagoon, how they transported all their food, munitions, machinery, and men thousands of miles through submarine-infested seas.

Senators will see the actual bombing of Kiska, now a daily mission; they will see a graphic record of the kind of soldier the American man can be.

Tomorrow, Thursday, first at 2 o'clock and again at 3 o'clock, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, the Members of Congress are cordially invited to see the motion picture. Of course, members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate will be expected to attend.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. Charles A. Park to be a rear admiral for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from May 1, 1943; and

Don A. Jones and David M. Whipp, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from May 15, 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Wallie E. Beasley, to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired (adverse report).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman Collison, of Bridgeville, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware, in place of James H. Latchum.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

William J. Cronin, Jr., from the State of Connecticut, to be area director, at \$5,600 per annum, in the New Haven area office.

John R. Kelly, from the State of Indiana, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Muncie area office.

Joseph H. Braunagel, from the State of Illinois, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Peoria area office.

Edward D. Connor, from the State of Indiana, to be area chief of training, at \$4,600 per annum in the Chicago area office.

Arthur C. Gernes, from the State of Massachusetts, to be deputy regional director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

George C. Estill, from the State of Florida, to be regional chief of manpower utilization, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Donald H. Roney, from the State of California, to be senior labor market analyst, at \$4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

Julian Capers, Jr., from the State of Texas, to be senior information specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Edwin E. Knott, from the State of Missouri, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Washington area office.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. George Walter Vaughn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Capt. Elmer Matthew Webb, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1937.

TO CAVALRY

Lt. Col. James Brian Edmunds, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 18, 1941.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Capt. Jacob George Reynolds, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Henry Crandall Newcomer, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1942, effective June 30, 1943.

Second Lt. Arvol Duane Allen, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Harold Reid Armstrong, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. James Moore Boyd, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Lewellyn Clifford Daigle, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from October 5, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Usher Gaines, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Jay Jaynes, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Boylston Brooks Lewis, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. John Raymond Sands, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Samuel Frederick Stebelton, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Sam Powell Wagner, Cavalry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from June 12, 1943

Lt. Col. Joseph Logan Arthur, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Stewart Bragdon, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. George Jacob Richards, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Lehman Wellington Miller, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Douglas Lafayette Weart, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Earl Ewart Gesler, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John French Conklin, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. William Frazer Tompkins, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

×Lt. Col. Douglas Hamilton Gillette, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Donald Angus Davison, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

×Lt. Col. Henry Spiese Aurand, Ordnance Department (temporary major general).

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1942.

Rear Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of June 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Howard K. Veach, Carlisle.

Ethel Hibbard, Loyall.

Edward Schindler, Middletown.

Dorothy M. Kent, Morgantown.

Frank W. Mimms, Trenton.

Lovella L. Campbell, Vicco.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, minister of the Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, and president of the World's Christian Endeavor Society, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou art God of our fathers, God of our country, and our God. Thou hast companioned us through dark days. Thou art the comrade of our lives. We invoke Thy presence. Pour out the spirit of courage, of fortitude, and of faith upon our country. Be with the President of the United States and all who are associated with him in leadership above us and beneath Thee, that we will remember our sons who are on all fronts of the world—on the land, on the sea, and in the air—offering now the last full measure of devotion that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

We do not seek deliverance from responsibilities. We do not ask exemption from sorrow and from sacrifice. We pray for wisdom and for power. May we for those times be adequate as were those in other times for their occasions. We pray Thy blessing upon this institution, upon these Representatives of the American people. We pray that they shall give now not only for ourselves alone but for all men and all women and all little children everywhere the stored resources of the years. Lead on, O King Eternal. May we find a just and lasting peace as we win this war and may we win the peace not only for ourselves and for our sons and daughters but for the children of men through generations that are to

be. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for food.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 157):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. CAPPER and Mr. REED members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

POSTAL RATES ON FIRST-CLASS MATTER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement with the Speaker, and the majority and the minority leaders and the ranking Members on both sides of the Ways and Means Committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 134, to continue the temporary increase in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1001 (a), as amended (relating to temporary increase in first-class postage rate), of the Revenue Act of 1932, and section 2, as amended (authorizing the President to modify certain postage rates), of the act entitled "An act to extend the gasoline tax for one year, to modify postage rates on mail matter, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1933, are further amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945", and by striking out "June 30, 1943," wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, just long enough for the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio will recall, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It

simply extends for the present the 3-cent postal rate for another 2 years.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. How much money will this bring in?

Mr. COOPER. The report of the Post Office Department is that the estimated revenues yield, due to the additional 1-cent postage on first-class matter, is \$130,000,000 per year. The estimated total yield of first-class mail for 1942 is \$492,885,000. The estimated total yield of second-class mail for 1942, is \$26,793,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to object to the consideration of this proposition, but it seems to me that when several publications in this country that might well be dispensed with at the present time are getting a rake-off of many millions of dollars a year each in their postage reductions, we might at least give some consideration to the individuals in America who have to pay this 3-cent postage—the mothers and fathers who write their sons in the armed services. I understand that the deficit caused by these publications amounts to around \$100,000,000 a year, almost as much as they now ask to take from the masses of the American people who write individual letters. If we are going to continue this policy, I submit that both these matters should be brought before the House and be given consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF LIBERTY SHIPS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, and in one to include a letter written by the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, to a constituent of mine, and my constituent's reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night on the subject of rolling back prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by William T. Kerr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.